

*IN THE SAME SERIES:*

GUILTY MEN

by "Cato"

201st thousand

THE TRIAL OF MUSSOLINI

by "Cassius"

121st thousand

*In preparation:*

HERE ARE THE TORIES

by Simon Haxey



# YOUR M.P.

by

GRACCHUS

350  
ml  
238145

LONDON

VICTOR GOLLANCZ LTD

1944



THE TITLE of this book may, to some, be misleading. In that respect, however, the title fits the subject.

The subject dissected here is the Member of Parliament who has ruled us since 1935. He is your M.P., for all the big things that matter to you. He may not be the man you write to, complaining of a local injustice or enquiring into the incomprehensible verbiage of a government department. But he, with four hundred others of the same pattern, represents the majority; his decision to accept someone else's decision has decided and now decides your fate.

Those who have sat in the House of Commons without any control over our affairs—except, perhaps, as junior partners forbidden to raise “controversial” questions—are left out of this account. As Lord Baldwin has said, quoting a previous Prime Minister, “No great country was ever saved by good men.” This book is about the Conservative and National Liberal saviours of our country.

*First published April 1944*

*Printed in Great Britain by  
The Camelot Press Ltd., London and Southampton*



# CONTENTS

CHAP.	PAGE
INTRODUCTION . . . . .	7
THE BEGINNING OF THE STORY . . . . .	9
I. THE BEST GENTLEMEN . . . . .	11
II. FREE AND INDEPENDENT . . . . .	17
III. PATRIOTISM BY THE PINT . . . . .	26
IV. WHERE WERE THE ARMS ? . . . . .	35
V. ANGLO-GERMAN FELLOWSHIP . . . . .	42
VI. JUST BEFORE DUNKIRK . . . . .	51
VII. MR. CHAMBERLAIN'S FRIENDS . . . . .	59
VIII. PROPERTY'S PATRIOTS . . . . .	71
IX. THE SOUL OF A TORY M.P. . . . .	80
INDEX OF M.PS. . . . .	93



they are now quite what they were some years ago. The Tory who praised Hitler's loyalty and sincerity may now—almost certainly does now—hold another opinion. He has changed; a good job, too! But that does not wipe out his responsibility for his speeches and votes of the past. Nor does a change in his opinions and aims alter the essence of his character. He is still, in spite of any changes, the sort of person who could believe what he did believe in 1935 or 1938, and the sort of person who could, in May, 1940, the month of defeat, vote to keep Mr. Chamberlain in power.

In the same way when I mention a directorship, a shareholding, or a connection with Big Business, in descriptions of a Member of Parliament, it should be remembered that since the facts mentioned were first printed the Member may have given up his directorship or sold his shares. Again, the interest is that he is the sort of person who at some time would have these connections.

Because Major Patriot is the average, essential, ordinary Tory M.P.—though the things that happened to him were different from the average and usual—you, Reader, can judge by studying him not only those sitting Members who will offer themselves for re-election (when this Parliament at last remembers that the country is sometimes supposed to be consulted), but also the new candidates, the “men of promise,” who will ask you, as patriots, for your votes.

I should add that, although in this book I give a number of M.Ps. good advertisement, by reprinting their most interesting speeches, none of these gentlemen have paid me or will pay me anything for this service.

1943.

TIBERIUS GRACCHUS.



## THE BEGINNING OF THIS STORY

*R*UNNING UP THE STAIRS made him puff; short of wind. This was a worrying, stale sort of life, being an M.P.; not enough time for exercise. As he hunted round the boy's room for that book with a white-and-blue cover—he had forgotten its name—he realised that he had run up the stairs because he hated being in the boy's room; he had run to get it over quickly. A fear was in the room; had been there three years now. There was the book; he snapped the light off and locked the door behind him.

Then the telephone rang. A hundred seconds later, Robert Patriot, still feeling the thump of his heart-beats, knew that he had lost more than half the meaning of his life. His only child was dead, his son, in a German prison camp.

The boy had been captured at Dunkirk, too badly wounded to escape from the torn beach. He had mended slowly—bullets through the stomach. And then there were bad reports; he was back again in hospital; another operation and another. He had died on the day, in December, 1943, when this war had lasted exactly as long as the last one did.

Wearily, and with a feeling of numb emptiness, Robert Patriot hunted along shelves again, this time for railway time-tables. There was a train to Nottingham; three hours later, just before midnight, he could get the night train north. He had to go to break the news to his wife.

He couldn't do it: three hours, at Nottingham, and no time to book a sleeper. A train full of people; he wanted to avoid the eyes of people. He wanted to avoid seeing and hearing his wife suffer. Yet . . .

A feeling of guilt, like a deep wave, came over his head. He did not know where such a feeling of self-accusation came from; he had done nothing to deserve all this—was it from not doing things? His boy, out there; a life not started yet, and death uncomforted. . . . His eyes were pricking, and his hands shook.

Yet he could not bear to let anyone else tell Mary, his poor wife. He put the book he had just found into his case; he would walk down to the station. Twice he picked up the telephone receiver, to tell—he could not bear it; he put the thing down again.

The War Office had been quite certain.



*I have no liking for Robert Patriot. But the misery he felt was real, human—and destroying. Whatever he had done or not done, neither he nor any like him ought to suffer as he did. Somehow, our side can no longer bear that people should be tortured.*

*Part of his torture took the shape—which is often part of what we call “a nervous breakdown”—of an implacable grip on his mind by a grim immovable certainty that he was to blame.*

*Sitting in the first jolting slow train, he sought within his mind, desperately, compulsively, to know where he had failed his son.*

*And all his thoughts turned and returned, at first, around the idea that he should not have allowed the boy to take his commission in 1938.*

*None of his thoughts, at first, went towards Parliament and the votes he had given; none turned to the years that made the war.*

*We can know more of these things than any part of Robert Patriot's mind would, in those first hours, admit.*



## CHAPTER I

### THE BEST GENTLEMEN

“Call together the best sort of gentlemen, and declare unto them these great preparations and arrogant threatenings.”—QUEEN ELIZABETH, in letters to Lord Lieutenants before the sailing of the Spanish Armada.

THE BEST SORT of gentlemen sat in Westminster during the four years before the Nazi *Blitzkrieg* smashed through to the Belgian coast. Many of the acts of these gentlemen made it easier for the Germans to conquer Europe. By votes and speeches, and by omission to vote or speak, some four hundred odd Tories and National Liberals supported the governments of Mr. Baldwin (now Lord Baldwin of Bewdley) and of Mr. Chamberlain. The policies of these governments gave aid and comfort to our enemies, and left us, in 1940, without allies capable of effective resistance to them.

This is not another book about Lord Baldwin and Mr. Chamberlain. Their status as “Guilty Men” is well established; it need not be confirmed here. But others besides these Prime Ministers, others who were not even in their Cabinets, had the power to alter or to influence policy. As Mr. Winston Churchill said (on 17.11.38) “one healthy growl” from the back benches on the Tory side of the House might have altered all the tragic story of our failure to make the arms we needed; his words are just as applicable to the foreign policy that led us via Munich to Dunkirk and Singapore:

“Honourable Gentlemen above the Gangway—pledged, loyal, faithful supporters on all occasions of His Majesty’s Government—must not imagine that they can throw their burden [of responsibility] wholly on the Ministers of the Crown. Much power has rested with them. . . .”

Major Patriot was one of the back-benchers “above the Gangway”; it was to him and his like that Mr. Churchill spoke time and again—quite vainly.

On foreign policy, as on armaments, it was possible for Tory M.Ps. to influence the Government against the policies that gave Europe to Hitler. With very rare exceptions, most of which will be duly and fairly noted, they never tried to do so.



It is not necessary to retell here the abject story of the years of appeasement. Abyssinia blockaded and abandoned, the League of Nations wrecked, Hitler's troops marching to what is now the Siegfried Line—a breach of the Treaty which the French were ready to oppose, from which Hitler could have been forced to retreat—and then the list of murdered countries: Austria, Spain, Czechoslovakia, Poland. All those years from 1935 to 1940 our enemies grew stronger and our allies weaker, less sure of themselves and of us.

By what mesmerism did the Tory majority tread this road? I can only answer for Major Patriot. He followed the road that led to Dunkirk because he believed it was the right road. Honestly and sincerely, he thought that Hitler was in his own way rather admirable, and he loathed and feared "the bestial passions of Leninism" so religiously that he could feel quite happy at the idea of strengthening the Nazis in order that they should "save Western civilisation" and destroy Bolshevism.

In this view he was confirmed by his friends. I give as a sample the views on Hitler and Hitlerism of half a dozen men he liked or respected:

The Right Hon. L. C. M. S. Amery (Sparkbrook): "We cannot afford to pursue any policy which would bring us into conflict with Germany, Italy and Japan. We should therefore avoid any step which tied us closely to Russia" (19.7.37, *Daily Mail*). Previously, in the year when Hitler came to power, Mr. Amery advocated "some measure of rearmament for Germany" (18.11.33, at Sparkbrook); and a month earlier still he said to the Birmingham Rotary Club: "Herr Hitler's dramatic performance would create alarm for a while, but it would not hinder for long, if it did not actually promote, the process of European consolidation."

Colonel the Hon. J. J. Astor (Dover): "There was no cause for such alarms [about Hitler's accession to power] and they were unjustified" (22.11.33, at Dover).

A. Beverley Baxter (Wood Green): "I believe we are very foolish in this House sometimes, those of us who refuse to believe that there is any good in National Socialism, or that there is no unselfishness in men like Hitler and Goering" (26.1.38, House of Commons).

The Right Hon. R. A. Butler (Saffron Walden): "If the Socialist Party is prepared to make friends with Russia, which is a dictatorship with which no Englishman can really agree, why can we not make friends with Italy and Germany? There are people saying Herr Hitler has broken his word. I tell you



there is one bargain he has made—that is that the German Navy should be only one-third of the British Navy—which he has kept, and kept loyally ” (15.11.38, at Bridgwater).

R. J. E. Conant (Bewdley): “ The Liberal-Socialist proposal for an alliance with France and Russia against the Fascist powers he described as peculiarly dangerous at present ” (4.4.38, *Yorkshire Post*).

C. T. Culverwell (Bristol, W.): His speech in the Munich debate “ gave the greatest satisfaction in Berlin ” (6.10.38, *Evening Standard*). He said: “ I ask those who hate Hitler . . . what has Hitler done of which we can reasonably complain ? . . . Let us try to forget his misdeeds of the past, and the methods which, no doubt, we all of us deplore, but which I suggest have been very largely forced upon him.”

A year later, when we had been at war with Hitler for twelve weeks, Mr. Culverwell asked for a “ peace by negotiation. . . . The only chance of secure and enduring peace is by negotiation, and the only opportunity is now, before the war is intensified.”

He deplored the possibility of a British victory because “ the most likely result will be a strengthening of Russia, and the spread of Communism westward. I can even visualise our troops fighting side by side with the Germans to defeat the Bolshevist menace ” (30.11.39, House of Commons).

These quotations cover, very inadequately, of course, the years from the Nazis’ taking of power to the third month of the present war. Mr. Culverwell, when asked about the last of these speeches, denied indignantly that it was in any way “ defeatist ”: he was much in favour of a “ vigorous and efficient prosecution of the war, but I regard the promotion of peace as equally important.”

There you have, in their own words, the sort of things that Major Patriot’s colleagues said to him. German rearmament was necessary; it would be a good idea to make friends with the Nazis; Hitler was loyal to his promises; Hitler and Goering were not lacking in unselfishness. And what had the leaders of Germany done—by the end of 1938—about which we could reasonably complain ?

I have quoted only from Members whose names begin with the letters A, B, and C. There is nothing like beginning at the beginning. And it would be hard for anyone to argue that these initials are the best for “ showing up ” the Tory Party. It happens that when you look at the ABC of Toryism you run across the names of Vyvyan Adams, the Duchess of Atholl, Brendan Bracken, and Randolph and Winston Churchill.

The first two of these were active members of the Executive of



the League of Nations Union, and did what could be done for collective security to prevent this war happening. Mr. Bracken and Mr. Winston Churchill were the only two Tory M.Ps. to vote for a Ministry of Supply on 17.11.38, after Munich, when war was very close and the making of new arms was desperately urgent. They had pressed for such a Ministry for some years.

So the ABC Tories are not all like the six I have first quoted. There were two possible ways of warding off the war that was coming so fast: collective security and serious rearmament. Some few Tory M.Ps. stood for both of these, with a varying emphasis on the importance of each. Which makes all the stranger the failure to attempt either. It would be easier to understand the mind of Major Patriot if all the members of his party had pooh-poohed the threat of Nazi aggression.

An unworthy suggestion has been made about some members of the House: that they liked Baldwin and Chamberlain so well and feared and disliked Churchill so much that they could not bear to vote for Churchill's policy. This cannot have been the reason for the votes and speeches of any of them; they have always loved Winston, even when they left him in a minority of two within his party; they always thought he was a great orator even when they refused to pay attention to his warning speeches.

Major Patriot, perhaps by accident, never found it possible—before May, 1940—to listen for more than about five minutes to Mr. Churchill's "gloom." But he was a little uneasy when a colleague reported to him, in 1934, what Churchill had said about the German Air Force. This force, then illegal under the Treaty of Versailles, was soon going to be openly announced by Hitler—when he was sure that we should not dream of holding him to that Treaty. Churchill said it was "rapidly approaching equality with our own." Major Patriot did not like that idea. He was reassured by Mr. Baldwin's flat denial: "It is not the case that Germany is approaching equality with us. Her real strength is not 50 per cent of our strength to-day."

He was still more reassured when a friend of his, a City man and therefore "on the inside," quoted to him the view of Mr. Churchill put out at that time by the *Economist*: "brilliant but erratic . . . an unerring instinct for hitting on the worst possible policies."

But his main reassurance came not from the honesty of Mr. Baldwin, nor from the knowledge that all the "safe men" of the City felt we were much more secure while Churchill was "out in the wilderness"; his main reassurance came from the bulk of the Members around him. They were quite certain that there was no



alternative to appeasement. Why, collective security meant trusting the Russians !

Let us take another sample from the ABC of Toryism, this time on the question of Russia.

We can begin with Mr. Amery again :

" Let there be no more muddle-headed mumbling about strengthening the Covenant, when they knew perfectly well that this meant neither more nor less than committing ourselves to entanglement in a Franco-Russian alliance against Germany, Italy and Japan " (19.11.36, *The Times*).

Viscountess Astor (Plymouth, Sutton) spent part of 1938 denying the existence of any " Cliveden Set." We naturally take her word. It was only an accident that, when Members and journalists wanted to be convinced that the Russian Air Force was hopelessly inefficient, they could meet at Lady Astor's a " real expert," Colonel Lindbergh (who later became, as near as the laws of America allowed, a Nazi propagandist against Britain). It was because Lady Astor entertains everybody that Germans, sent here to explain the unselfishness of Hitler and Goering, could find a rewarding and appreciative audience at her table.

Lady Astor's views on Russia are well known. True, she was kind enough to say after a visit to Russia that Stalin " is a very nice little fellow, brown, bright-eyed, and well-conducted " (16.10.37, *Daily Express*). But she believes that Communism " denies God and religion. It breaks up family life. These, to my mind, are the fundamental crimes of Communism " (5.3.39, *News Chronicle*). That her feelings on this matter have changed less than those of some others—or that she is franker—seems likely from a remark she made in 1942, at the beginning of the battle for Stalingrad, when she opposed demands for a Second Front in Western Europe by saying " the Russians are fighting for themselves, not for us."

W. J. Anstruther-Gray (Lanark, N.) disliked the Soviet system so heartily at one time that he wished to damage our own trade in order to cut down that of Russia, which he described as an " avowedly hostile " country. He said in the House on 31.1.34: " We don't want the Russian export market. We could do without the timber and oil from that country. . . . Our welfare does not depend on selling goods to Russia."

Allen Chapman (Lanark, Rutherglen) said in the House on 9.11.36: " the Russian experiment is nothing but a colossal failure."

W. Craven-Ellis (Southampton) has declared Russian conditions to be " very much like slavery " (25.2.32, *Daily Telegraph*).



The Right Hon. Sir Ronald Cross (Rossendale) said in July, 1941—after the Russians had become our allies—that “the Russian system of government is hated throughout England. Only a tiny minority think it better than the Nazi dictatorship.”

One other name should, alas ! be added when we are making up, from among the ABC Tories, a half-dozen or so whose dislike of Russia comforted Major Patriot, in the years from 1935 to 1939, and made him feel that there was no real alternative to the policy of appeasing Fascism. It is the great name of Churchill.

Mr. Churchill's opposition to Nazi aggression was whole-hearted; he pressed, rammed, hammered home the need to rearm. But on Russia his own past held him captive. Soon after the War of 1914-18 ended he stated his policy to be “Peace to the German people; war on the Bolshevik tyranny.” His mastery of the English language has seldom been stretched more fully than in his descriptions of the Soviet Government and the Russian system and people:

“That foul combination of criminality and animalism” (10.4.19).

“The avowed enemies of civilisation” (3.1.20).

“Crocodiles with master minds” (in his *World Crisis*).

“An infected Russia, a plague-bearing Russia . . . the soldiers are incited to mutiny and kill their officers, the mobs are raised against the middle classes to murder them, to plunder their houses, to steal their belongings, to debauch their wives” (28.7.20).

“The blood-dyed tyrants of Moscow” (20.9.24).

“Foul deeds . . . a load of shame and degradation” (21.10.24).

“Filthy butchers of Moscow” (27.10.24).

“Cosmopolitan conspirators from the underworld” (28.11.25).

“Diabolical machinery all over the world” (19.6.26).

“The dark conspirators in the Kremlin” (22.6.26).

“Degraded Russian barbarism” (23.7.27).

All this was long ago? Yes. And in the years when Major Patriot was in the Commons, Churchill no longer spoke in this way about Russia? Yes. But Churchill's mind was not quick to change, and how far it remained in the same mould about the Soviets can be seen from a much more recent speech. Broadcasting on 20.1.40, Mr. Churchill said:

“The service rendered by Finland to mankind is magnificent. They have exposed for all the world to see the military incapacity of the Red Army and of the Red Air Force. Many illusions about Soviet Russia have been dispelled by these fierce weeks of fighting in the Arctic Circle. Everyone can see how Communism rots the



soul of a nation ; how it makes it abject and hungry in peace, and proves it base and abominable in war."

Here then are the first dozen witnesses: six for not worrying much about Hitler, six for being very worried about Russia. Twelve out of the eighty-six Tory members whose names begin with the first three letters of the alphabet.

There were other influences on the mind of Major Patriot.

*Major Patriot, an hour before his train reached Nottingham, tried to distract his mind with the book that old Bletchley had told him was so good. He didn't remember the name of the fellow who had written it, and opened it at random without glancing at title or author. Whoever the fellow was, he rode in trains a lot and talked to people. Major Patriot skipped ten pages—the old King's funeral. . . . Couldn't bear that, the idea was too close. A new chapter :*

*" I spent a fortnight of February, 1936, abroad, in Germany and Italy. My first visit to Germany after Herr Hitler's accession to power was in May, 1934, and in the June issue of the English Review I placed on record the view which I had formed after a long personal interview with him. I described Herr Hitler as capable of rising to great heights, but to-day reserving his strength and authority for the tasks of the near future, destined to become in Germany a venerable and revered figure."*

*He dropped the book.*

## CHAPTER II

### FREE AND INDEPENDENT

" I think I see a free and independent kingdom delivering up that which all the world hath been fighting for since the days of Nimrod ; yea, that for which most of all the empires, kingdoms, states, principalities, and the dukedoms of Europe are at this time engaged in the most cruel and bloody wars: to wit, a power to manage their own affairs by themselves. . . . My Lord, patricide is a greater crime than parricide, all the world over."—

JOHN HAMILTON in the Scottish Parliament House,  
2.11.1706.

A NUMBER OF THE U-BOATS that have killed so many of our sailors were built with Major Patriot's kind permission.

The Treaty of Versailles forbade Germans to have a Navy of any size that mattered, or to have any submarines at all. In June,



1935, it was announced that Sir Samuel Hoare (Chelsea) had negotiated with Herr Ribbentrop an Anglo-German Naval Treaty. This treaty allowed the German Navy to be 35 per cent of our Navy's strength in surface warships, and 45 per cent in submarines.

The French had not been told. To add insult to injury, the new treaty had been signed on the anniversary of Waterloo—a battle in which, though Lord Vansittart may not remember it (and Major Patriot had never been told it) a Prussian army joined with Wellington's to defeat Napoleon's Frenchmen.

The new treaty strengthened our enemies, in a way particularly dangerous for the life of Britain. None of the "pledged, faithful, loyal" patriots gave a "healthy growl." None even whimpered.

Germany at the beginning of 1935 was a country quite unable to go to war. The Treaty of Versailles forbade the German Government to have an Air Force, or a Navy of effective size, or to conscript men into any of the German armed forces.

On January 1, 1935, Hitler conscripted labour for rearmament.

On March 16, Hitler reintroduced military conscription.

In April, 1935, Hitler announced the existence of the *Luftwaffe*, the bombers that have smashed our cities.

And our patriots—what did they do? They prepared to win the next General Election, under the leadership of Mr. Baldwin.

In order to win the election, they had to make a sacrifice that was later announced "with appalling frankness":

"Supposing I had gone to the country and said that Germany was rearming and that we must rearm. . . . I cannot think of anything that would have made the loss of the election from my point of view more certain."—Lord Baldwin, then Mr. Stanley Baldwin, 12.11.36, House of Commons.

"From 1933," said Mr. Baldwin in the same speech, "I and all my friends were all very worried about what was happening in Europe." But because "there was probably a stronger pacifist feeling running through the country than at any time since the War . . . my position as the leader of a great party was not altogether a comfortable one. I asked myself . . . what chance was there within the next two years of that feeling being so changed that the country would give a mandate for rearmament."

That speech alone ought—if we took our politics really seriously—to defeat every Tory M.P. at the next election.

It is revealing not only in what it says: that "worry" over Europe had to be put on one side in order to win a General Election; that the leaders of a great party with an immense



majority dare not let the people know the truth—that Germany was rearming and we must rearm. Mr. Baldwin's speech is also revealing for what it leaves out.

He leaves out all reference to the Versailles Treaty being broken by the Germans. Certainly, feeling in Britain was pacifist. But even the most pacifist of all prominent politicians at that time, old George Lansbury, had insisted that "we cannot for a moment consent to the rearmament of Germany" (16.10.33), and two days later, speaking officially on behalf of the Labour Party: "we shall oppose the rearmament of Germany." I admit old Lansbury was so complete a pacifist that he would not have insisted on the Germans being held forcibly to the Versailles Treaty; he pleaded instead, too late, that every nation should disarm to their level. But the Labour movement and the people of Britain were being told—by Mr. Amery, by Sir Arthur Balfour, by Lord Simon, by a host of others—that it was sensible to allow "some measure of German rearmament." It was against this that they revolted, as much as against the idea of our having to arm ourselves. And there was a clear majority in the country for the full programme of League of Nations resistance, up to and including armed resistance, against any aggression.

This was proved in the Peace Ballot of 1935. This "plebiscite" has been misrepresented. Tories claim that it showed how "pacifist" the British people were, and because of this "pacifism" they—the party in power—could not oppose Nazi rearmament or the subsequent Nazi aggressions. But the Peace Ballot did not show "pacifism." Every "pacifist" in the country worked for it, canvassed, whipped up support for it. Yet on the vital last question the vote was nearly three to one against the "absolute" pacifist position.

This last question was: "Do you consider that, if a nation insists on attacking another, the other nations should combine to compel it to stop . . . by, if necessary, military measures?" The votes were: *Yes*, 6,784,368; *No*, 2,351,981.

To the first and easiest question: "Should Great Britain remain a member of the League of Nations?"—the answers were: *Yes*, 11,090,387; *No*, 355,883. So it is clear that two and a half million people who answered the first question could not make up their minds about the last one. They were not sure whether it would be right to combine for collective security, or to be ready to fight if necessary against an aggressor. But over six and a half million people were clear: it would be right to fight.

Summarise it this way: six for, two against, two doubtful. That was the verdict of the Peace Ballot, on the question of military



resistance to aggression. And since the ballot was backed and blessed by every pacifist and semi-pacifist organisation, the feeling in the country cannot have been more definitely pacifist than that.

For the Tories to explain their policy of *not* resisting aggression by this Ballot vote is as truthful as saying that two millions are more than six millions.

The people of a free and independent kingdom told their rulers, as clearly as they could, what they were feeling. They were not pacifists; they were against war. (Which is sometimes rather a different thing.) The British people were ready, in 1935 as in 1939, to stop Fascism spreading, growing more powerful, getting ready for war. They were reluctant, naturally and rightly, to use arms for that purpose, if other ways could be found. But even so the majority of them, even in 1935, were ready to use arms.

And Germany in 1935 could not have made war. That is the essential point. Hitler could have been forced to stop rearming, without fighting—if our Tory rulers had really wanted him to stop rearming.

An American observer comments:

“During this period the fear of Communism, not of Nazism, was the great British bogey. Germany, under Hitler, with its early programme of vigorous opposition to Communism, was looked on as a bulwark against the spread of the doctrine throughout Europe. Sir Arthur Balfour, in speaking of the Russian danger, said, ‘one of the greatest menaces to peace to-day is the totally unarmed condition of Germany!’ To-day that is strangely ironic” (John F. Kennedy, *Why England Slept*, p. 82).

Ironic, but not strange.

For Sir Arthur Balfour was one of the new sort of business statesmen developed during this century. Director of the National Provincial Bank, managing his own important company and chairman of two steel firms, he spent most of his time, not on these businesses, but on affairs of State. He was a member, at various times, of twenty-one Government Committees, commissions or enquiries—all to do with industry and finance. When he spoke on Germany and Russia, big money was speaking. And its aim was clear.

Major Patriot also has money. I do not honestly think that he is in politics out of any corrupt desire to increase or preserve his wealth. But in some rather simple and fundamental way the possession of a “modest fortune” influences political belief. We have noted, in the words of witnesses, that in the period of 1933–8



it was not necessary to worry about Hitler; or, if you did worry, it was more important to win the General Election. We have noted also a certain distaste for Bolshevism, which ruled out collective security. (For, as the Trade Union Congress put it bluntly in its September, 1938, resolution, "collective defence against aggression and to safeguard peace" meant that the British government must "unite with the French and Soviet governments to resist any attack upon Czechoslovakia"). Is it possible to believe that the lack of worry about Hitler, and the great worry about Russia, is unconnected with the fact that Hitler left rich people (apparently, at any rate) to enjoy their riches, while the Russians were an awful example of doing exactly the opposite?

In other words, ought we to say of Major Patriot that because he has money he trusted Hitler, hated the Russians, approved German rearmament—and so made this war inevitable? I doubt it. It was not quite so simple as that. Men's minds are made up of all sorts of things—particularly if you have been educated at Eton, as Major Patriot was. Consciously, he cares very little about money; he is only on the board of two companies—which is not much for a Tory M.P. However, his feeling that the economic system which enables him to be comfortably well off cannot reasonably be condemned is quite strong. And few would deny that possessions have an influence on conduct; something was said about that nearly 2,000 years ago.

So let us marshal the witnesses again; were the colleagues who surrounded Major Patriot the sort of men, with the sort of incomes and business connections, who seem naturally to take the line of appeasement? First, from among the dozen noted in the previous chapter, we find that Mr. Amery has been a Director of the Southern Railway and of Messrs. Cammell Laird—a great engineering firm linked to Vickers.

Colonel J. J. Astor is one of the few people in the world who have received a present, a gift, of over a million pounds. His father gave him £1,400,000 in 1915. When this kind father died, Colonel Astor and his brother were left about £40,000,000.

Viscountess Astor was the subject of an illuminating article by Harold Laski in the *Daily Herald*, 19.4.30:

"Talk of her riches and she will explain how admirably they are used. . . . She and her wholly admirable husband will support most good causes, except the essential cause. . . .

"She is anxious to leave the impression that she is aware of the responsibility of great riches. . . . There is always about her democracy the sense of the great lady being kind to the poor. And



her anger with interrupters suggests that, somewhere within herself, there is a still small voice which whispers doubt of the right of the working classes to question her."

Mr. R. A. Butler married a Courtauld; the *Daily Express* on 23.2.28 reported a £12,000,000 bonus (gift) to shareholders by the Courtauld Company, and estimated that the Courtauld family, according to the figures then known, made from this bonus a profit of £1,900,000. The shares held by this family had at that time an estimated market value of more than £11,000,000.

Sir Ronald Cross was described by the *Daily Mirror*, 5.9.39, as "A wealthy man. His grandfather founded one of the largest cotton concerns in Lancashire, and it was after early associations with the cotton trade that Mr. Cross became a merchant banker."

Those five are enough, from our first dozen witnesses. Let us add some more, from the ABCs.

Brigadier-General Sir W. Alexander (Glasgow, C.) is a director of British Celanese, a firm with a capital of nearly £9,000,000, Deputy Chairman of an oil company, and used to be a Director of Charles Tennant & Co., Ltd. His business interests do not take up all his time; he voted against the Government's Catering Bill on 9.2.43, and for the Government's shelving of the Beveridge Report on 18.2.43. He also voted, in the period we are considering, as Sir Samuel Hoare (and M. Laval) wished him to on Abyssinia (19.12.35), as Mr. Chamberlain wished him to on Munich (6.10.38), and for confidence in Mr. Chamberlain as Prime Minister on 8.4.40—three weeks before Dunkirk.

Sir Irving Albery (Gravesend) is a member of the Stock Exchange and senior partner in the family firm, I. Albery & Co. He may have had some influence on Major Patriot's mind by his solicitude for those detained, during this war, under Regulation 18B. He has spoken in the Commons about "the Bastille of Brixton," where these men were detained. He said in February, 1943, about Sir Barry Domville,<sup>1</sup> that he could not believe that a man with his distinguished service and loyal record would do anything detrimental to his country.

Sir Irving Albery's interest in this matter reminds me that there were Tory M.Ps. who belonged, in 1937 or 1938, to the Anglo-German Fellowship, an organisation of which a temperate description is given in Chapter V. We may as well interrupt our study of the merely fortunate to give here those who were

<sup>1</sup> Admiral Sir Barry Domville was founder and Chairman of "The Link," described officially during this war as an organisation for German propaganda. See also p. 48.



members of this Fellowship, according to its published lists, whose names begin with the first three letters of the alphabet:

Lieut.-Commander Peter Agnew (Camborne, Cornwall).

Lt.-Col. Sandeman Allen (Birkenhead, W.).

The Hon. W. W. Astor (Fulham, E.—son of Lady Astor).

Sir Ernest Bennett (Cardiff, C.—“National Labour”).

Sir Robert Bird (Wolverhampton, W.—Chairman of the firm that makes Bird's Custard).

Commander R. T. Bower (Cleveland—who married a daughter of Lord Strickland).

The work of the Anglo-German Fellowship, one can fairly say, did little to warn Major Patriot of the war that Hitler was planning.

The Rt. Hon. Sir John Anderson (Scottish Universities) now Chancellor of the Exchequer, doubtless learnt some of the highways and byways of finance when he was a director of Vickers Ltd. and of Imperial Chemical Industries, two firms that are among the largest in the world. His services to the nation on A.R.P. come into a later chapter.

Mr. Ralph Assheton (Rushcliffe) represents an older type of wealth. When he married a daughter of Lord Hotham, it was noted that this was an alliance of two of the oldest land-owning families in Briton. Both families have been sending representatives to Parliament since the year 1324. Mr. Assheton, however, moves with the times; he has had twelve years on the Stock Exchange.

Mr. Assheton greatly comforted Major Patriot at one point in 1940, when the war had been going for over six months and yet the “war effort” of Mr. Chamberlain's Government left nearly a million men unemployed. Mr. Assheton answered an awkward question on this by pointing out that “the reserve of unemployed of 972,000 constituted a hidden reserve of strength and power for this country, which was not possessed by other nations which have reached full employment.” A very good explanation—until you think about it. Some people thought about it very bitterly a few weeks later, at the time of Dunkirk.

Sir Adrian Baillie (Tonbridge) was left £140,000 by his brother, and married the daughter of Lord Queenborough, heiress to Mr. Whitney, an American multi-millionaire.

Lady Baillie is the owner of Leeds Castle, in Kent, and it was there that Herr Rosenberg, Hitler's propagandist (second only to Goebbels) stayed with the Baillies in 1933.



About the next two on my list, connections with the aristocracy seem all I need to note. Sir Brograve Beauchamp (Walthamstow, E.) married a daughter of the Earl of Carnarvon; Major the Hon. R. E. B. Beaumont is the son of Viscount Allendale, a great landowner, who left him £200,000.

Sir Alfred Beit (St. Pancras, S.E.) said to the *Daily Herald* (20.3.31): "I am a rich man. . . . I shall belong to the extreme right wing of the Conservative Party." His father left over £3,500,000. As he is or was director of very successful investment trusts, there can be little doubt of the truth of his statement about being a rich man. On the other hand, he has not achieved his ambition of belonging to the extreme right wing of the Tories. Though he voted for the Government on Abyssinia and Munich, he did not vote for or against Mr. Chamberlain in May, 1940; he voted *for* the Government's Catering Bill in 1943; and when Sir Oswald Mosley's release from detention was debated late in the same year, he was one of the two Tory M.Ps. who voted against release. (He is married to a Mitford—a cousin of Miss Unity Mitford and of Sir Oswald Mosley's wife. So perhaps he knew the Mosley family too well.)

Sir Reginald Blaker (Spelthorne) is an exception in my list. The *Evening Standard*, 25.3.35, reported that he had announced he would not seek re-election; he could not afford it. "In my opinion," he said, "a married man with an income of £2,000 a year, apart from his salary as an M.P., cannot afford the expenses which a Member of Parliament has to meet." The local Conservatives, however, raised a fund to meet Sir Reginald's election expenses, and he was re-elected in 1935.

About Lt.-Col. D. Boles (Wells) the only very notable thing that I and two research workers have been able to find is that he holds—or held—the record for the highest score in the Eton and Harrow cricket match. I apologise to him if we have missed other and more important features in his career.

L. H. Boyce (Gloucester) is Chairman of the Gloucester Railway Carriage and Wagon Company and director of seven other companies.

Mr. R. A. Brabner (Hythe) is a merchant banker.

Major A. N. Braithwaite (Buckrose) is a director of Guardian Eastern Insurance Co., Ltd., Middlesex, Essex and other Brick Cos., and has been a director of Sir Lindsay Parkinson & Co., Ltd.

Sir William Brass (Clitheroe) is an estate agent, and a director of the Guardian Assurance Company.

Little is in our records about Captain R. Briscoe (Cambridgeshire). Eton and Magdalen, the Grenadier Guards, a recent



appointment as Lord Lieutenant of Cambridgeshire—these outline the man. The *Evening Standard* stated in 1924:

“ Captain Briscoe believes in brevity. ‘ You know all about Mr. Baldwin’s policy,’ he told a big audience the other afternoon. ‘ That is what I support.’ And off he went to play in a village football match.”

A general election was then being fought. Captain Briscoe got in.

Sir George Broadbridge (City of London) was Lord Mayor of London in 1936. His fortune, which is considerable, was largely made out of tin.

P. G. T. Buchan-Hepburn (East Toxteth) was educated at Harrow and Cambridge. The *Daily Telegraph* wrote of him as a “ lucky young man ” when he was adopted for this safe Tory seat (16.1.31):

“ East Toxteth, I believe, imposed a number of conditions, some of them involving a financial burden not within the capacity of all those whose names were submitted ” (as possible candidates).

Captain Bartle Bull (Enfield) is the eldest son of a Canadian millionaire. He married a Miss Baur of Chicago, who inherited half a million pounds.

G. R. Hall Caine (Dorset, E.) is a director of nine or ten companies. He said to the *Sunday Chronicle* on 5.2.38:

“ Being the member for East Dorset has cost me £37,000 in the last seventeen years, and, deducting the amount received in salary, I have paid the nett figure of £31,000. . . . Many M.Ps. spend far more than I do in their constituencies.

“ It is lamentable,” he went on, “ that Conservative seats should be put up for auction and sold to the richest candidate.”

That raises a point of so interesting a nature that it deserves a new chapter.

*Who on earth was it thought of Hitler as a “ venerable and revered figure ” ?*

*Major Patriot picked up the book: Thoughts and Talks, by Sir Arnold Wilson. And he was quite certain he knew who Arnold Wilson was; yet he could not remember. An M.P. like himself. He tried to think of his colleagues in the House. Their faces would not come into his mind; when he imagined one of his friends, the friend looked unusually ugly, a caricature.*

*Major Patriot started reading again, partly, I think, to find out, from this book, who Arnold Wilson was. If he had been feeling fit, he would have remembered at once. His memory’s failure was another reinforcement, somehow, of that feeling of guilt.*



*This chapter was full of praise for Mussolini, a denunciation of the sanctions we imposed at the time of Abyssinia. He skipped through eighty pages. Then:*

*"A week spent this month [September, 1936] at Nuremberg during the annual Party Congress. . . . It was my seventh visit in three years, during which I have watched the tree which I saw sprouting in 1933 grow quickly, in almost precisely the form intended by those who planted it: it has begun to flower. . . ."*

*Nottingham: an hour late, so there are only two hours to wait—if the express is on time, which is not very likely. He put the book away. But he could not keep his mind off his son's death, except by reading something. And it was the only reading matter he had with him.*

### CHAPTER III

## PATRIOTISM BY THE PINT

*"A party of great vested interests, banded together in a formidable confederation; corruption at home, aggression to cover it abroad; the trickery of tariff juggles; the tyranny of a well-fed party machine; sentiment by the bucketful; patriotism and imperialism by the imperial pint."—MR. WINSTON CHURCHILL's description of the Conservative Party after he first left it, 8.5.1908.*

*"The party of the rich against the poor."—MR. CHURCHILL again, on the same subject, 30.1.1909.*

IN THESE FIRST three chapters we are tracing some, if not all, of the causes that imposed on Britain "the vacillating and unworthy foreign policy and the disgraceful lack of armament which brought this war upon us"—to quote the words of the Prime Minister's son, Captain Randolph Churchill (letter of 12.3.43 from North Africa, *Evening Standard*, 31.3.43). In our search for these causes, for the reasons why Major Patriot, M.P., voted as he did, we have looked briefly at his colleagues' views about the Nazis and the Bolsheviki in the decisive years, and we have looked at some of these colleagues themselves, their "independence"—which usually consists of possessing "independent means"—and their average place in our society. We have noted that many are men of great possessions, and—while we do not



attribute all their politics to their possessions—we have agreed that wealth and position do have some effect on the general political attitude of an individual or a group.

Now we go deeper still: we find one of our witnesses, one of Major Patriot's Tory colleagues, saying that "it is lamentable that Tory seats should be sold to the richest candidate."

And, turning back, we find a reference to a "financial burden not within the capacity of all" potential candidates (East Toxteth), and another M.P. complaining that "a married man with an income of £2,000 a year" cannot afford to be an M.P. (Spelthorne).

There is plenty of evidence on this. P. W. Donner (Basingstoke) was reported by the *Morning Post*, 28.6.35, to have said that he "had been forced to leave Islington, his present constituency, on the grounds of health and economy. The Hampshire Executive (of the Tory Party) had asked him for a subscription less than half what he was paying in Islington."

The Hon. Quintin Hogg (Oxford) wrote in the *Nineteenth Century*, January, 1934, that "the local Tory associations are rotten to the core." In one agricultural constituency, he wrote, prospective Tory candidates have been informed they need not apply unless they can subscribe to the organisation the fantastic sum of £3,000 per annum.

In a northern industrial city, £600 a year is the least annual subscription that the Association will consider.

According to a valuable study recently published, *Parliamentary Representation*, by J. F. S. Ross, the average amounts of election expenses for contested elections in 1935 were in round figures:

					£
Conservative candidates	.	.	.	.	780
Liberal candidates	.	.	.	.	520
Labour candidates	.	.	.	.	360

One Conservative candidate, Mr. Ian Harvey, published in January, 1939, a memorandum headed "A Plutocratic System," which goes so far as to state that "in nearly every case" (when candidates for Tory seats are chosen) "the question of finance is of primary importance." He estimated that men "have always an excellent chance of being adopted" if they are willing "to pay all their election expenses (anything between £400 and £1,200) and to subscribe between £500 and £1,000 (a year) to the local Association."

The Federation of University Conservative Associations, meeting in London as Mr. Ian Harvey's memo. was published, passed



unanimously a resolution deploring the influence on the choice of candidates of "considerations of personal fortune."

In the book by Mr. Ross there are further examples, from Frome in Somerset, Hendon, and the University of London Conservative Association. Mr. Ross calculates that only one person out of each 1,150 of the adult population has the income necessary to have "an excellent chance," in Mr. Harvey's phrase, of being adopted as a Tory M.P.

When Mr. R. A. Brabner (Hythe) was chosen as candidate, it was stated in the London Press that he "will pay £500 a year to the Conservative Association, and his election expenses. That is a fairly moderate contribution for a safe seat near London" (*Evening Standard*, 27.6.39).

The same inquisitive newspaper noted, about Lt.-Col. F. G. Doland (Balham and Tooting), that his is "an expensive seat to fight. The Conservative candidate's election expenses are between £700 and £800. . . . I understand that the Conservatives expect their candidates to find this money out of their own pockets, and, in addition, to provide a 'subsidy' of about £600 a year" (13.7.36).

Sir Derrick Gunston (Thornbury), one of the very few Tory M.Ps. on the Executive of the League of Nations Union, spoke more recently on the subject of "purchaseable seats":

"Rich, safe seats, with ample resources that could be tapped, are too lazy to make the effort to raise the money as long as they can find rich men who, while unwilling to go through the mill of fighting an election, are nevertheless prepared to pay for a safe seat. In practice you find the able but less well-off candidates fighting the hopeless seats. It is the rich, safe seats which demand the highest contributions" (*Evening Standard*, 2.10.41).

Let us try to be clear what all this evidence amounts to. It does not mean that every Tory buys his seat. It means that enough of them do so to matter a great deal—to matter so much that very many other Tories protest, are uneasy, try to get the matter altered. (But do not succeed in doing so.)

"The party of the rich against the poor" is so simple and so striking a description that it may give a wrong effect. There is one Tory working man who has gone far: Sir Walter Womersley (Grimsby), whose job it is to see that pensions are paid economically. Two other Tory M.Ps., Mr. Denville (Newcastle, C.) and Mr. Rowlands (Flint), started life as working men. There may be another Tory M.P. or two who started with the advantages and disadvantages of ordinary men. Among the National Liberals, Mr. Ernest Brown, part of whose job used to be to build us



houses—in twos, or even in half-dozens—seems to have done so. Research fails to find any more.

In previous chapters, keeping to the Members whose names begin with the first three letters of the alphabet, I have described—sometimes, I admit, very incompletely—a specimen group of M.Ps. Let me note the remainder in this category; otherwise some critic will remark that I broke off the list in order to distort it.

Sir Edward Campbell (Bromley) is one of the few poets in the House. A sample of his poetry:

*“ It is Hitler, that Hun, that we are up against,  
For all that he does is sinister,  
And the best way to put an end to him  
Is to assist Churchill, our great Prime Minister.”*

I quote this achievement out of fairness to the Tory M.Ps.; we should not only think of them in terms of their money, their responsibility for this war, etc.; their intellectual and artistic contributions should also be taken into account.

Colonel W. H. Carver (Howdenshire) is a director of the L.N.E.R. and of a brewery company.

R. A. Cary (Eccles) was in the Dragoon Guards, and married a niece of Lord Curzon.

Somerset S. de Chair (Norfolk, S.W.) is the son of an Admiral. He wrote, when very young, that he felt “the profoundest admiration” for Mussolini. He announced in August, 1939, according to the *Daily Telegraph*, 9.8.39, that there would be no war for Britain this year: “there will no doubt be a manufactured crisis . . . but that is not the same as war.”

H. Channon (Southend-on-Sea) married Lady Honor Guinness, one of a family not unknown to most of us. He was described by the *News Chronicle* (6.3.38) as having been at one time “a friend of Herr Ribbentrop.” In February, 1940, it was reported that Prince Frederic of Prussia, caught in Britain by the outbreak of war, was a guest—“on parole”—of Mr. Channon at Kelvedon Hall, near Brentwood.

Lt.-Col. R. S. Clarke (E. Grinstead) is director of a couple of companies.

Sir R. Clarry (Newport) is a director of several companies, and Managing Director of the Duffryn Steel and Tin Plate Works.

Captain E. C. Cobb (Preston), who was educated at Sandhurst, has been in controversy with Captain Randolph Churchill. This is awkward, for Preston is a two-member constituency, and the gallant Captains are the two Tory Members for it. When Captain



Churchill said that the Conservative Party in recent years "had tended more and more to be identified with the propertied classes, and that those who dominated and controlled the Party had served the interests of a purse-proud, acquisitive and selfish minority," Captain Cobb answered that such a statement was "an insult to the electors."

Sir Thomas Cook (Norfolk, N.) is a grandson of the founder of the most successful tourist agency of the same name. He is a Master of Foxhounds.

The Rt. Hon. A. Duff Cooper is difficult to characterise briefly. To his credit, he resigned from Mr. Chamberlain's Government at the time of Munich. That, I think, should be allowed to wipe out much of his previous record—as, for example, his statement that "I feel that between Italy and England there can never be any serious misunderstanding" (*Daily Telegraph*, 24.11.37).

Mr. Duff Cooper is brother-in-law to the Duke of Rutland and nephew of the Duke of Fife. He adds to the evidence: "It is as difficult for a poor man, if he be a Conservative, to get into the House of Commons as it is for a camel to get through the eye of a needle" (*Evening Standard*, 14.3.39).

Colonel the Rt. Hon. Sir George Courthope (Rye) belongs to a family that has owned land in Sussex since the year 1493; he was at one time Chairman of the Central Landowners' Association. He is a director of the Southern Railway, and Chairman of Ind Coope and Allsopp, which owns and controls over 3,000 licensed houses.

He distinguished himself by the warmth of his support for Mr. Chamberlain in May, 1940, when he said that critics of the Government were making "a mountain out of the Norwegian mole-hill. . . . The force employed was very small, and to suggest that this was a major military disaster is sheer nonsense. . . . I, for one, believe in his [Mr. Chamberlain's] leadership, and I hope it will continue."

Captain H. B. Trevor Cox (Stalybridge and Hyde) is a company director.

Lord C. Crichton-Stuart is a son of the Marquess of Bute; he married the Marchioness of Lansdowne. He inherited about half a million pounds from his father.

Captain the Rt. Hon. Harry Crookshank (Gainsborough) was described by the *Daily Express*, 18.9.37, as having "plenty of money, few interests, and no wife. Is fond of dogs, of horses, and his Rolls Royce." He told the Lancashire Iron and Steel Institute in April, 1938, that it was the policy of Mr. Chamberlain's Government (of which he was a member) "to make our defences so



secure that it would be unthinkable for anyone to attack us ” (23.4.38).

J. F. E. Crowder (Finchley) is a member of Lloyds, and Secretary of the 1922 Committee, of which the name was recently changed—perhaps because of the reactionary and pro-Chamberlain reputation this Committee acquired—to the “ Conservative Private Members’ Committee.”

That finishes my list of the ABC Tories. Four more are mentioned later in this chapter. I have left out over a third of their number, about whom the only information available was even more tedious than in the cases mentioned. I doubt if I have left out any Tories who influenced Major Patriot towards patriotism, though about one or two, such as Mr. Boothby (Aberdeen, E.), I have not made up my mind. Out of the eighty-six Tory members whose names begin with these three letters I have now mentioned fifty-four—and two Churchills. From the fifty-four let us deduct those whom I have mentioned as trying to warn our Major Patriot: Vyvyan Adams and Brendan Bracken. (I have not counted the Duchess of Atholl, who is no longer in Parliament.) Let me also omit Mr. Boothby, and, with more hesitation, Mr. Duff Cooper. To have played in the Eton *v.* Harrow match, or to have perpetrated appalling verse, is of no serious political importance; but they may be enough to mark the social class; so I leave in the two gentlemen thus noted. We now have fifty Members who can be described as belonging to our nobility and gentry, and to the majority who influenced Major Patriot. There are seventeen titles among them; nineteen of them have a rank in the Services before their name in the official handbooks. At least four are millionaires; eight may be.

Major Patriot did not, of course, mix only with colleagues whose names begin with certain letters of the alphabet. But I feel that I have given a fair picture of those who influenced his mind when I pick out for particular description this group. The rest of the Tory M.Ps. are like that—or more so.

If anyone doubts that, let them try for themselves a dip into other letters of the alphabet. I particularly recommend the middle letters, L and M: A. T. Lennox-Boyd (Bedford, Mid.), Captain Oliver Lyttelton (Aldershot), Captain J. H. F. McEwen (Berwick and Haddington), T. Magnay (Gateshead), Captain (now Viscount) Margesson, and Lt.-Col. Sir Thomas Moore (Ayr Burghs) are some of the names I find in this part of the index. To some of these gentlemen I shall have to make future reference; let me only say here that it would have been more fun to deal at a little length with some of these than with the ABCs.



But before I go any further I ought to give a brief list of men who I do not think were of much influence in the mind of Major Patriot. That is because he did not often see or hear of them. Take, for example, the year 1938—a year when the Spanish Republic was still fighting, when the menace of world war was approaching, but a change in Britain's policy might have prevented war happening, or might have made it only a brief affair if Hitler bluffed too far. I have gone through the first 100 votes or divisions in the Commons in that year, to note how those who represent and rule us paid attention to the job for which they are paid—the job on which our peace depended, and the lives of so many.

My list is incomplete. I give only some of those who excelled. Here in alphabetical order, are the number of times certain M.Ps. are recorded as having voted, out of those 100 divisions in 1938:

Lt.-Col. Sir W. J. Allen (Armagh) . . . . .	27
Colonel H. W. Burton (Sudbury) . . . . .	27
Sir Samuel Chapman (Edinburgh, S.) . . . . .	24
N. C. D. Colman (Brixton) . . . . .	32
Lt.-Col. A. V. G. Dower (Penrith and Cockermouth) . . . . .	8
G. Gledhill (Halifax) . . . . .	28
N. B. Goldie (Warrington) . . . . .	34
Captain A. Hambro (Dorset, N.) . . . . .	34
Dr. A. B. Howitt (Reading) . . . . .	32
Sir George Jones (Stoke Newington) . . . . .	26
Sir Frederick Mills (Leyton, E.) . . . . .	35
R. H. Morgan (Stourbridge) . . . . .	14
R. Purbrick (Walton, Liverpool) . . . . .	6
Colonel Sir John Shute (Exchange, Liverpool) . . . . .	20
T. Somerset (Belfast, N.) . . . . .	16
W. J. Stewart (Belfast, S.) . . . . .	9

Of course, some of the absences that these figures imply must have been due to illness. Being a Member of Parliament is not like the jobs ordinary people have, in this respect. The *Daily Telegraph*, 25.3.43, noted that Lord Dunglass (Lanark) returned to the House of Commons in that month "for the first time for nearly three years. He had had a prolonged and serious illness."

The Members we have listed may have suffered from illnesses not so severe as that of Lord Dunglass—who was Parliamentary Private Secretary to Mr. Chamberlain until 1940, and may well have felt severely the strain of such a position.



Or, on the other hand, some of them may share the attitude to Parliament of Sir John Leigh (Clapham), whose business and legal worries have perhaps kept him away from the House during certain periods. He was first elected in 1922; in 1924 the following was printed in *The Times* (23.7.24):

"Huge profits made by promoters in the forming and re-forming of Lancashire cotton companies during the war boom were disclosed yesterday at Oldham Bankruptcy Court. . . . Among those who assisted to purchase companies (said Sir William) was Sir John Leigh. . . .

"Questioned about profits made by re-forming companies, Sir William gave figures totalling £892,000. These profits, said Sir William, were profits received by Sir John Leigh."

Next year these worries continued. The *Evening Standard*, 7.7.35, printed the following:

"The shareholders will have lost their entire subscribed capital, and will apparently be called upon to pay the uncalled capital,' says the Manchester Official Receiver in a statement to the creditors on the failure of the Leigh Waste Company of Oldham.

"The Company, says the statement, was founded to acquire the business of John Leigh & Co. . . . the result has been disastrous to the shareholders.

"Referring to the actual cost of the purchase of the business, the Official receiver says:

"On the whole, it is considered that Sir John Leigh, knowing all the facts, made a hard bargain, and he must have known the present company could not expect to make the profits his own private company had made."

"The Official Receiver finds it difficult to avoid the conclusion that the object of forming an intermediary company was to avoid the comment that might have been forthcoming had a company with a capital of £72,000 been converted into one of a £11,000,000 at a single step."

In 1930 the Commons had some all-night sittings. After one of these—according to the *Daily Mail*, 21.6.30—some of Sir John Leigh's colleagues felt tired, and wired to him:

"Sixty-eight Conservative M.Ps. who have been on duty all night earnestly ask you to exercise your privileges as a Member."

Whether or not the result of his exertions, Sir John Leigh's attitude to Parliament led to the comment of the *News Chronicle*, 11.1.35, on his General Election campaign in that year:

"Sir John is a political will-o'-the-wisp. Only three meetings have been arranged for him between now and polling day, he



does no canvassing, and committee rooms seem to be his pet aversion. . . .

"Sir John Leigh is virtually an absentee candidate. This is not a new experience for Clapham. Politically, Sir John is continually being marked Absent.

"In the last publication of voting records in the House of Commons, where he has represented Clapham for thirteen years, Sir John's name does not appear at all. Yet the first M.P. on the list is credited with 304 votes . . . and the last with only 100. . ."

Sir John has, since those days, found it possible to attend and vote when great issues were being debated. Our Index of M.Ps. shows this.

Besides those who, to a much lesser extent, followed the lead of Sir John Leigh, another group of Tory M.Ps. had little direct effect on the mind of Major Patriot. This group, perhaps larger than is generally known, can be described by a single example. Captain Henry Hunloke (Derbyshire, W.) who was elected at a by-election to succeed his brother-in-law, Lord Hartington, was described as follows in the *Sunday Express*, 29.5.38:

"The man who will carry the Cavendish banner into battle at the present by-election is Mr. Henry Hunloke, who married Lady Anne Cavendish, sister of the new Duke of Devonshire. If Henry had not married Lady Anne, he would not be a candidate in West Derbyshire.

" 'I lead a normal life,' he tells me. 'I hunt and shoot. Fishing I love, too. And I have a passion for billiards and croquet.' "

Major Patriot had his hobbies and his interests. But he attended Parliament fairly regularly, and was serious about his work. He was particularly serious about his speeches in his constituency; there he preached patriotism by the gallon, rather than "by the imperial pint."

*Waiting on the cold platform, the man who had lost his son thought a little about patriotism. He himself had changed since 1940; and his memory was not working very well. He felt indignant that an M.P. should have written about Hitler and Hitler's Germany so warmly. He looked at the cover of the book with disgust: "The Right Book Club" was printed on it. Think of putting out that sort of stuff as propaganda for Toryism! That was what the Right Book Club was supposed to do, he thought.*

*The book repelled him and yet drew him. He must not be left alone with his own thoughts. There was just enough light to read by in the airless waiting-room:*

*"The new Germany is more prosperous. . . . The physical well-being of*



*the nation's youth is a pleasure to see: the poorest are better dressed than of old: their faces are witness to psychological change for the better. . . ."*

*And even praise for their Army!*

*"The Fighting Services are in Germany so closely interwoven with the fabric of national life that they are rightly regarded, with the Public Works Service Camps, as part of the educational and social services of the nation."*

*The hunted thing within his mind asked him: who was it killed the boy?*

#### CHAPTER IV

### WHERE WERE THE ARMS?

"The situation as regards equipment caused me serious misgivings. I had on several occasions called the attention of the War Office to the shortage of almost every nature of ammunition, of which stocks in France were not nearly large enough to permit of the rates of expenditure laid down for sustained operations before the War."—LORD GORT's Dispatches on the campaign in France and Belgium (before Dunkirk), *London Gazette*, 17.10.41.

ON FEBRUARY 11, 1937, Mr. Neville Chamberlain moved a financial resolution authorising a loan of 400 million pounds, to be spent on rearmament over the five following years. He estimated that with the increased amounts available from ordinary Budget sources, £1,500,000,000 would be available in those five years. Later this was again increased, and the Government asked for and received the power to spend 2,000 million pounds on rearmament.

Two thousand million pounds is a lot of money.

Three years is a considerable time; and it is over three years from February, 1937, to May, 1940.

Yet in May, 1940, in France and Belgium, our soldiers were scandalously short of the weapons they needed.

"There was a shortage of guns," said Lord Gort in his Dispatches, "in some of the anti-tank regiments of the Royal Artillery, while armour-piercing shells for field guns had not, by May 10, been provided."

Shortage of "almost every nature of ammunition"; shortage of guns; and for most of the guns we possessed, no shells that were



good against tanks. And the Germans were putting between 3,000 and 5,000 tanks into the battle !

Against these thousands of modern machines we had exactly twenty-three tanks with weapons that could do any damage to an enemy tank. Lord Gort writes, under the heading of "Lessons":

"It was clear from the outset that the ascendancy in equipment which the enemy possessed played a great part in the operations. He was able to place in the field no less than ten armoured divisions. On the other hand, the British armoured forces in the theatre of war amounted to seven divisional cavalry regiments equipped with light tanks, one regiment of armoured cars of an obsolete pattern, and two battalions of infantry tanks, the latter, except for twenty-three Mark II tanks, being armed each with one machine gun only."

Civilians should perhaps be told that the "divisional cavalry regiments," of which Lord Gort reports seven, are only small parts of a division; all of them put together did not number as many tanks as one of the ten German panzer divisions. The "infantry tanks . . . armed each with one machine gun only" were obsolete and could not stop an enemy tank; all the German tanks had heavier weapons that were dangerous to our machines.

So 2,000 million pounds, and three years, produced twenty-three modern tanks at the right place and time for decisive action.

Could the guns and shells and tanks we needed have been made ?

In three years, August, 1914, to August, 1917, Britain produced over 5,000 guns—enough for a force five times as large as Lord Gort's. In those same three years we produced a supply of shells for them heavier than could have been used by Lord Gort's army.

In two years, October, 1916, to October, 1918, we made nearly 2,000 tanks—of which many hundreds had heavier guns than those of any tank in Lord Gort's army.

So the guns, shells, tanks we needed could have been made. But we had the Tory Party in power. Some of them must know where the millions of good money went. We are not allowed to know.

The arms we needed in 1914-18 were made because the industry of this country was on a war footing—was organised for the job. The arms were not made in 1937-40 because the Tory Party refused to "impede the course of normal trade"—Sir Thomas Inskip's words, May 21, 1936.

Inskip was Minister for the Co-ordination of Defence. He



admitted, in this debate, that the new arms factories that were being built had not got priority over private firms in securing delivery of the necessary machine tools. Machine tools were the bottle-neck; and Toryism preferred that they should go first to firms making profits, and only later to firms making weapons.

Inskip complained, with horror, of Churchill's proposals for a Ministry of Supply; he (Churchill) "would take the gigantic stride which would put a great part of our industrial system on a war footing."

British rearmament began, on a very small scale, during 1936. During 1937 it was supposed to be going fast, and during 1937 even faster. Major Patriot was reassured by colleagues who said that we were getting lots of arms; but he was a little worried at the beginning of 1937 by Sir Thomas Inskip's statement that the Royal Air Force had only eighty-seven squadrons, "thirteen of which were on a single flight basis," i.e. had only one-third the normal number of first-line planes. That meant, according to some, we had less than a 1,000 first-line planes, as Churchill pointed out. Sir Thomas denied this; said we had 1,150.

Major Patriot never looked up past debates; or he would have found that the Government had claimed 850 first-line planes in March, 1935. In other words, the effective strength of our first-line Air Force was increasing at the average rate of only three planes per week !

Just as a figure for comparison, we might note that when Hitler took over Czechoslovakia he captured—according to figures he gave in the Reichstag on April 28, 1939—over 1,500 planes. Assuming that these included training and reserve machines, this would mean a first-line force of at least 500 machines.

In other words, by the surrender at Munich the Tory Government gave Hitler more aeroplanes than they had managed to build for the R.A.F. in most of 1935, all 1936 and some of 1937 !

The same story about tanks. Hitler captured, without loss to his forces, 469 Czech tanks in 1939—thanks to Mr. Chamberlain's action in 1938. That is a larger number than all our years of rearmament provided for Lord Gort's army. Over 500 A.A. guns, over 43,000 machine guns, over a million rifles—these were among Chamberlain's gifts to Hitler. His gifts to Britain, in three years with all the money he needed, were, in each of these types of armament, considerably less.

How on earth did Major Patriot persuade himself to vote for a Government that gambled in this way with the lives of our people and the life of our country ?



Some say he did not know the facts. I find that hard to believe. Among his colleagues were men responsible for all the armament industries.

Those whose names have appeared at various past times on the lists of shareholders of Vickers include :

Sir John Anderson, director, until he joined the Cabinet.

Colonel H. P. Mitchell (Brentford and Chiswick).

Lord Hailsham, Secretary of State for War, 1931-35; his name is on the list of 18.4.32.

Others with interests, past or present, in other great arms firms can be listed as follows :

Rt. Hon. L. S. Amery (Sparkbrook), Cammell Laird, director until in Cabinet.

Sir E. Ramsden (Bradford, N.), B.S.A., director.

Sir P. Hannon (Moseley,) B.S.A., director.

Then there were over twenty Tory M.Ps. interested in aircraft production : over fifty who were interested in the heavy industries and in engineering. Others, not directly interested as directors or shareholders, had a wide knowledge of production and the course of trade. One or two, gently and discreetly, grumbled that the orders for weapons were not being handed out as they might be. Sir Herbert Williams (Croydon, S.) in November, 1938, said that " all this talk of mobilising labour was just nonsense. Not the slightest need for it. Between 80 per cent and 90 per cent of the engineering firms in the country had not had a single order for rearmament."

That quotation, and the fact that over a million men were unemployed during the three years in which the Tories were supposed to be rearming us, disposes of a second excuse they sometimes make : that the labour was not available.

Of course, there were shortages of some types of skilled labour. But these could have been—and were in fact later—overcome, when those in charge of our destinies wanted to produce the goods.

They did not want to, in 1937-9. The reasons ? First, and most important, they did not believe a war was coming.

Sir Edward Grigg (Altrincham) said after Munich : " I believe that when the P.M. [Chamberlain] went to Munich, the war lords at that time felt a wind upon their foreheads which boded them no good. On that basis I believe we can build, and therefore I am all for the policy of appeasement " (6.10.38, House of Commons).



If that means anything, I take it to mean that Hitler and Mussolini were frightened of Mr. Chamberlain. The faculty of self-deception, in this degree, is rare.

Sir Patrick Hannon (Moseley) worked hard at the theme of permanent peace. He "described the Anglo-Italian agreement as the most important incident in the relationship of nations and the promise of permanent peace in the world since the Great War" (*Times*, 18.4.38).

"Mr. Chamberlain's letter to Signor Mussolini was the beginning of a step-ladder that would lift us up to a permanent peace" (*Yorkshire Post*, 7.12.38).

"Believe me, there is going to be no war" (*Daily Express*, 17.5.39).

Commander O. Locker-Lampson (Handsworth) "prophesied that there would not be another Great War. . . . The country was now farther away from war than it was last year.

"The time is coming," he said, "when the bullies of Berlin will be brought to their knees, and the man who will do it is Mr. Neville Chamberlain" (*Yorkshire Post*, 13.6.39).

The Rt. Hon. W. S. Morrison (Cirencester) refused in 1938 to alter the Government's restrictive policy on agriculture; "What fools we should all look if we interfered with the industry [agriculture] . . . to guard against a war that never happened" (*Daily Express*, 11.6.38).

The *Daily Express* commented acidly on 13.4.39: "Last weekend Mr. Morrison was appointed chief of Britain's food defence organisation. He was made responsible for feeding the people in wartime, although, as Minister of Agriculture, he failed to increase home food production in peacetime, or to arrange for increased production in an emergency."

Major Duncan McCallum (Argyll) cheered his constituents by reporting to them, after Munich, that Hitler and all his party "will be thrown out of Germany by the Germans themselves" (*Evening Standard*, 7.12.38).

The Rt. Hon. Osbert Peake (Leeds, N.) spoke to the boys of Retford Grammar School five weeks before this war broke out. He advised the boys "not to be oppressed by the fact that their elders were constantly talking about possible war; there was too much talk of that kind. . . . Parents were doing wrong by perpetually talking of imminent war" (*Yorkshire Post*, 29.7.39).

But the national record, perhaps the world's record, for fatuous placidity must be allowed to Sir Thomas Inskip, now Lord Caldecote, whose figure sways through these years of storm like a barrage balloon in difficulties. He spoke as Minister for



Co-ordination of Defence, on August 31, 1939—a month before the beginning of this war. He said: "War to-day is not only not inevitable, but is unlikely. The Government have good reason for saying that."

Babies, if fretful, used to be given a rubber dummy to suck. Something perhaps in the face and figure of Britain's Co-ordinator of Defence, as well as in his achievement, reminds one of that function. He was successful—as a soporific. He lulled these M.Ps., not only with the reiterated promise that war would not occur, but also with vague statements about a "flood of armaments." On October 26, 1938, he said: "There is in almost everything—I think I may say everything—a stream which might fairly be called a flood of these armaments and equipment which we need to complete our defences."

Mr. Chamberlain had used the words about our forces: "terrifyingly strong." R. Butler (Saffron Walden), when challenged to justify this phrase, said: "I think our new Air Force and defences are in many ways terrifyingly strong. The question is, are they proportionately strong to other people's, and we shall do our best to see that they are" (11.11.38).

Earl Winterton, deputising for the Secretary of State for Air, told the Commons in May, 1938, that "the assurance I give the House, speaking not only as a representative of the Air Ministry, but as a Cabinet Minister, is that our defence programme has been framed in the light of the best estimates that can be made of the forces which may be brought against us."

A year later, Captain H. H. Balfour (Isle of Thanet) reported as Under-Secretary of State for Air that the Air Force was "progressing satisfactorily" (*Daily Telegraph*, 22.4.39).

After Munich, Mr. Chamberlain appointed a committee of six people outside the House of Commons "to receive representations as to any delays, defects or difficulties in supply or production under the rearmament programme." These six gentlemen included a Managing Director of Courtaulds, Ltd., the Chairman of Dunlop Rubber, a director of I.C.I., the Chairman of J. and P. Coats, Ltd., and Sir Geoffrey Clarke and Mr. F. D'Arcy Cooper.

Sir Geoffrey Clarke was a director of P. & O. Steam Navigation, and a member of the Anglo-German Fellowship. Mr. F. D'Arcy Cooper, Chairman of Lever Bros. and Unilever Ltd., was a member of the Council of the Anglo-German Fellowship.

Of course, Major Patriot was reassured by the appointment of this committee. Here were six successful men from the biggest firms in the country, none of them directly responsible for making



armaments, who could see to it that the goods were produced. And he was sorry when he heard that Mr. D'Arcy Cooper could not, for health reasons, remain a member of this committee.

But what a curious appointment this looks, now that we know so much more than Major Patriot knew in 1938. To speed up rearmament by calling in representatives of great monopolies, some of whom were members of the Anglo-German Fellowship!

The Anglo-German Fellowship is described at length in the next chapter. It would not have been mentioned here, in a chapter dealing with our lack of armaments, if it had not been that Mr. Chamberlain's appointment of such a committee to oversee rearmament naturally raises a question whether the views of this Fellowship affected the pace of our rearmament.

If those views were not in fact a governing factor in our failure to produce the necessary arms, perhaps we ought to judge that the ordinary views of ordinary Tories were quite sufficiently on the side of appeasement to make it unnecessary for the Anglo-German Fellowship to exert their influence.

For example, the Rt. Hon. R. S. Hudson (Southport), who on 24.7.39 told the *Daily Express* "that he is the British Minister behind the sensational scheme to lend a vast sum of money to Germany on condition that she takes the lead in disarmament." A responsible Cabinet Minister who could make such an offer to Hitler's Government, a responsible Cabinet that could allow him to do it, might also base their view of the urgency of rearmament on the hope that Hitler could be bought off, or persuaded to look eastward for his war.

Major Patriot knew vaguely what was happening. He knew that we were not "disturbing trade" to make arms; he knew that there were gaps and deficiencies. But he could not believe there was going to be a war with Hitler. There was too much in Hitler's way of dealing with people that struck him as sensible. Surely an arrangement could be made. . . .

*Still the train did not come. Pages of praise for the confidence, the faith, of these damned Germans. He put the book in his bag. He walked. He came back to the waiting-room to read again. Anything was better than remembering the boy—particularly remembering him when he was tiny.*

*Hope for youth . . . the spiritual value of the Hitler Youth movement—oh, why remind him of youth dead? Turn the page. (Even turning a page is an ending, a burial.)*

*"Then began a memorial ceremony and service of dedication, akin to the Christian rite of Confirmation, so simple, so moving, and so sincere as to merit, better than many customary religious rites, the title of worship.*



*The silvery note of trumpets brought the silent and reverent multitude of 70,000 spectators to their feet. A hundred flags dipped."*

*Religion? It was the first time he had thought of it, since the news reached him. Realisation of that forgetfulness deepened his feeling of guilt. He believed, of course, but . . .*

*His boy had not believed in it, he said.*

*This new, fake, brutal religion of the Nazis! Pages, this fellow had written, translations of their new hymns. He found a hatred in his mind.*

*Religion? His wife, poor, poor Mary, would try to comfort him, and herself, with that. The new hatred in his mind warmed him. He would read carefully, make notes, get ready to speak harshly, fiercely, against those who made this a religion. It killed sons.*

## CHAPTER V

### ANGLO-GERMAN FELLOWSHIP

"We have made a covenant with death; and with hell are we at agreement."—From an old book of which Major Patriot had little knowledge.

THE ANGLO-GERMAN FELLOWSHIP was formed after Hitler had achieved power in Germany, and after it was clear that he intended, in the words of *Mein Kampf*, that Germany should become "the lord of the earth."

The Fellowship replaced an older Anglo-German Association, which was composed of those who desired friendship between the British and the German peoples. This Association was not liked by the Nazis, and the majority of its members did not like the Nazis. They therefore dissolved the Association in 1935. A minority of the members, who presumably felt about the Nazis in a way different from that of the majority, came into the new Fellowship.

The first public function of the Fellowship was a dinner held on 5.12.35, in honour of Herr von Tschammer und Osten, President of the German Committee in charge of the Olympic Games. Among those present were Lt.-Col. Sir Assheton Pownall (Lewisham, E.), who was later listed as a member of the Council of the Anglo-German Fellowship, Vice-Admiral E. A. Taylor (Paddington, S.), who did not join the Fellowship, and Lt.-Col. Sir Thomas Moore (Ayr Burghs).

According to the *Annual Report* of the Fellowship, 1936-7,



members of its Council in those years included Sir Thomas Moore, Sir Assheton Pownall and another Tory M.P., Mr. Norman J. Hulbert (Stockport). Mr. Hulbert—now a Wing-Commander, R.A.F.—was Chairman of British Steel Construction, Birmingham, Ltd.

I have already reprinted, from the same *Annual Report*, the names of six Tory M.Ps. who were individual members of the Fellowship. Here are the rest of the list:

Clement Davies (Montgomery), National Liberal.

Sir Robert Gower (Gillingham).

Loel Guinness (Bath), son-in-law of the Duke of Rutland.

H. C. Haslam (Horncastle).

Wing-Commander A. W. H. James (Wellingborough).

Major-General Sir Alfred Knox (Wycombe).

Major Ralph Rayner (Totnes, Devon).

Sir Alexander Russell (Tynemouth).

Sir Frank Sanderson (Ealing).

Major the Hon. J. J. Stourton (Salford, S.).

Rear-Admiral Sir Murray Sueter (Hertford).

Lt.-Col. E. T. R. Wickham (Taunton).

Let us go through this list. Mr. Clement Davies, a director of Lever Bros. and Unilever Ltd., a firm with an issued capital of £67,000,000 has stated (much more frankly than most other M.Ps. in a similar position) that he regrets his membership of the Fellowship. It is very likely that others on the list, privately or publicly, have said the same thing; if so, it has escaped my attention. We can be quite sure that all of them have to some extent changed their views since they were members of the Fellowship.

Sir Robert Gower believed in 1936 that it was necessary to emphasise "the acute danger from Bolshevism that threatens Europe. That alliances should have been made between France and Russia and Czechoslovakia and Russia is lamentable. . . . The extension of Bolshevism throughout Europe remains the fixed determination of Russia. It is extraordinary that so many people in this country do not appear to be alive to the dire peril which exists.

"As Admiral Sir Barry Domville says, Herr Hitler and Signor Mussolini are the direct outcome of Bolshevism, and there can be no doubt that had it not been for them, Bolshevism would be devastating the greater part of Europe to-day" (letter to *The Times*, 31.7.36).

Sir Robert, who was in 1943 re-elected President of the Property Owners' Protection Association—which represents



investments valued at £500 million—cannot be taken as expressing the views of all his Tory colleagues on the Anglo-German Fellowship; but the letter to *The Times* from which I have quoted must have been near enough to the views of most of them.

Wing-Commander James was a fervent supporter of General Franco's cause during the Spanish Civil War. In particular, he argued hotly that the little Basque town of Guernica, scene of the first German experiment in modern bombing methods, was not destroyed by bombing, but was burned by the Basques themselves. He has since served under Sir Samuel Hoare in Madrid, and the *Daily Telegraph* reported that he "was the first Englishman allowed to shoot a Spanish ibex after the Civil War . . . the shooting of this ibex last June does not a little to enhance his prestige still further.

"One of the foreign sportsmen who preceded him in the Royal Preserve was a German officer of high rank then attached to General Franco's staff" (5.2.40).

Sir Alfred Knox was our Military Attaché in St. Petersburg (now Leningrad) in Tsarist days. In 1919 he went to Washington "to win over America to the policy of Allied intervention in Russia" (*Evening Standard*, 20.6.40). The policy mentioned was, of course, that of intervention designed to overthrow the Soviet Government.

The *Observer* wrote in 1937 that "in politics he has always been a die-hard" (12.12.37). General Knox wrote to the *Daily Telegraph*, 20.12.39, calling Stalin a "gangster," and deploring as a "tragedy" that Britain was "forced to look on inactive" at the war between Finland and the Soviet Union.

Major Rayner married the only daughter of a millionaire, Mr. S. A. Courtauld. The *News Chronicle*, reviewing his book, *Rude Letters to Youth*, commented: "Time after time Major Rayner refers enviously to the strong hand exercised on youth by Hitler and Mussolini." 14.7.37. In this book Major Rayner wrote: "The brutal truth is that to-day our British Young, on the whole, compare unfavourably with the youth of most of our neighbours."

Sir Frank Sanderson is Chairman of Salts (Saltaire) Ltd., Humber Fishing Co., Ltd., and director of United Premier Oil and Cake Co., Ltd.

Major Stourton attempted in 1936 to table a motion asking the British Government to avoid any military or other commitments which would have the appearance of an alliance between Britain, France and Russia, and to adhere to the policy of closer relations between Britain, Germany and France (*Evening Standard*, 2.7.36).



In 1938 he was fined £2 at Eastbourne for exceeding the speed limit. "The Clerk read a letter from him which said that, as this was not a Communist State, he was at a loss to understand why he had not been addressed on the summons by his correct name, which was Major the Honourable John Joseph Stourton. Although he was not unduly sensitive, he thought some explanation was due to him on this score.

"The Clerk said the explanation was that titles were not used on police-court summonses" (*Evening Standard*, 28.11.38).

Major Stourton is unlucky with police courts; he was fined again in 1943 "for using improper language within the hearing of the highway."

Lt.-Col. Wickham became P.P.S. to Captain Margesson in 1941. Captain—now Viscount—Margesson was the "organiser of victory" for Mr. Chamberlain's policies.

How should the work of the Anglo-German Fellowship be described? Readers will be able to judge the views of the majority of its members from the views of M.P. members I have quoted. Its work was the spreading of these views, in a way "divorced from party politics; its principal purpose is to promote fellowship between the two peoples, but however much such a purpose is non-political its fulfilment must inevitably have important consequences on policy" (*Annual Report*, 1936-7).

The then Secretary of the Fellowship, Mr. E. Wright, told a reporter: "It isn't numbers that matter. We want 'Names,' otherwise how can we have any influence with the Government or the Foreign Office?" (*News Review*, 23.1.36).

Among the German guests of the Fellowship, at various times, were Herr von Ribbentrop, now Hitler's Foreign Minister, Field-Marshal von Blomberg, at one time Hitler's Minister for War, and Freiherr von Hadeln, then Adjutant in the S.S. (Black Guard) to Herr Himmler, head of Hitler's Gestapo.

Simon Haxey's book, *Tory M.P.*—to which I am indebted for invaluable information, particularly in this chapter—mentions six members of the Anglo-German Fellowship who had the honour of meeting Hitler personally. None of them are M.Ps., so I need not list them here.

So the efforts of the Fellowship were aimed at having "important consequences on policy" and "influence with the Government and the Foreign Office"; we can surely assume that these "consequences" and this "influence" was not displeasing to Hitler, to Ribbentrop, to the Prussian Junker generals that von Blomberg represented, and to Herr Himmler's adjutant.

The policy and influence of the Anglo-German Fellowship



must also have met with something more than acquiescence by those great leaders of industry and finance who are all too often left out of account when we are talking of Nazi Germany. There is in Germany, for example, a very powerful Cologne banking house, that of Stein. Henrich von Stein is one of the directors of the Stollberg Co., which is largely controlled by an enormous combine, the Frankfurt Metallgesellschaft—which has among its directors men who are also chairmen of I. G. Farben, and of Siemens, and used to have a member of the British Cabinet.

Herr Bosch, Chairman of I. G. Farben, is also a director of the Nobel Dynamite firm in which our British firm, Imperial Chemical Industries (I.C.I.) is (or used to be) interested.

And we find Lord McGowan, Chairman of I.C.I., a member in 1937 of the Anglo-German Fellowship.

The Siemens group of combines also had British connections, too complicated to be traced here. Let us go back to the Stein banking firm. Herr von Stein has a partner, Baron Kurt von Schroeder. In the home of Baron von Schroeder took place, three weeks before Hitler came to power, the famous interview between Hitler and von Papen, the "reconciliation" that made it possible for Hitler to be appointed Chancellor.

And among the members of the Anglo-German Fellowship in 1937 we find H. W. B. Schroeder, with two fellow directors from the London banking firm of J. Henry Schroeder & Co.

In addition, this banking firm—headed by a member of the same family as that graced by Baron Kurt von Schroeder—joined the Anglo-German Fellowship as "a corporate member." Corporate membership may not be understood by all my readers; it is not common in Britain for large business firms to become members, in their corporate capacity, of propaganda societies. It should not be assumed that more than the majority of the directors in each of the companies concerned approved of its joining; some of the directors may not have approved. But it is of interest to note that the list of firms that were corporate members included two other banking firms, Lazard Bros., and Guinness, Mahon and Co., and also Unilevers—of which, it will be remembered, Mr. F. D'Arcy Cooper was Chairman when he was chosen by Mr. Chamberlain to look into "delays, defects or difficulties in . . . the rearmament programme."

I have already mentioned that Sir George Clarke, a second member of Mr. Chamberlain's Committee, was also a member of the Anglo-German Fellowship. A third member of the Committee was the Chairman of the Dunlop Rubber Co., Sir George Beharrell.



And we find the Dunlop Rubber Co. among the firms that were reported as corporate members of the Fellowship.

So the views of the Fellowship were very strongly represented on the Committee that had to determine what was a "delay," what was a "defect," what was a "difficulty" in rearmament. And as business men this Committee would naturally not consider armaments as an end in themselves; they would hold views as to the need for them, and therefore about the amount of delay in their production that was permissible; these views would be consonant with their views about the danger of war, the possibility of an armed conflict with Fascism. . . .

I have no doubt they did their work well—in consonance with their views.

After Munich, on November 19, 1938, the Council of the Anglo-German Fellowship unanimously resolved steadily to "prosecute its efforts to maintain contact with Germany, as being the best means of supporting the Prime Minister in his policy of appeasement."

At about this time the Fellowship was formed into a company, not limited and without shares. It had eighteen directors, two of whom were Mr. Hulbert and Lt.-Col. Sir Thomas Moore, already mentioned for their earlier membership of the Council.

The Company is now struck off the Register.

But Sir Thomas Moore is still Tory M.P. for Ayr Burghs.

I have left Sir Thomas to the end of this account of the Anglo-German Fellowship because he was more qualified than any others to state the case for their views.

His admiration for Fascism has been of long standing and explicit. He wrote in the *Daily Mail*, April 25, 1934, an article praising Sir Oswald Mosley and the British Union of Fascists. He asked:

"Surely there cannot be any fundamental difference of outlook between the Blackshirts and their parents, the Conservatives? For let us make no mistake about that parentage. . . . It [the B.U.F.] is largely derived from the Conservative Party. . . . Surely the relationship can be made closer and more friendly."

Sir Thomas Moore, eighteen months later, was re-adopted as Tory candidate for Ayr Burghs, and won the seat again in 1935.

The Conservative Central Office and the local Tory Association are not known to have objected to his praise for Fascism.

His views on Russia were also very clear. He told the House on 9.11.36 that Russia had settled her unemployment problem by exterminating the unemployed.

He also had views on social questions, and doubted the effect



of unemployment on physique. "The Socialists complain," he said in the same debate, "of the physical conditions of our citizens, which they say is due to unemployment, low wages and malnutrition. I would draw attention to the fact that in the recent Olympic Games the United States, with 11,500,000 unemployed, were first, and Germany was second. Wages are lower in Germany than in this country. Why then was Germany able to win so many contests at the Olympic Games?"

Sir Thomas Moore thought well of Hitler: "peace and justice are the key-words of his policy," he said (*Sunday Dispatch*, 22.10.33). He advocated that some of Germany's African colonies should be returned to her.

He wrote on 18.2.34: "Give Hitler a chance; I am satisfied Herr Hitler is absolutely honest and sincere."

The reader must also, clearly, credit Sir Thomas Moore with honesty and sincerity. And with a glowing patriotism. In the *Daily Mail* article I have already quoted he praised Mosley's Blackshirts for their "pride of race, love of country, loyalty." He went on: "the briefest study of the movement [British Union of Fascists] and the most casual examination of its members satisfy one that it is largely derived from the Conservative Party. This is perhaps natural for the instincts are the same, loyalty to the throne and love of country" (25.4.34).

In passing, it may be noted that Sir Thomas was not the only Tory M.P. to be impressed with the value of Mosley and his gang. E. L. Fleming (Withington) spoke in the Commons on 4.11.36 about a Fascist disturbance in the East End of London; he said the people who originated the trouble were the Communists, not the Fascists: "I tell my Communist friend, quite frankly, that if the same position occurs here as occurred in Spain, he would not find me on his side in this country. That explains why this question of Fascist meetings throughout the country must be dealt with in a very broadminded way."

And in the debate on Sir Oswald Mosley's release from detention (1.12.43), when Mr. Grenfell, of the Labour Party, called Mosley a "proved enemy of the State," there were loud cries of "No, no" and "Not proved" from the Tory benches. Mr. Grenfell asked, "Does anybody dare to stand up and say he was not an enemy of the State?" And Commander Bower, Tory M.P. for Cleveland, said: "Yes, I do."

For the sake of completeness we should add a mention of "The Link." It was founded by a member of the Anglo-German Fellowship, and all the members of its Council were members of the Fellowship. It published the *Anglo-German Review*. This Review



supported appeasement and termed Mr. Winston Churchill "undoubtedly the biggest warmonger in the world to-day." It also called Mr. Anthony Eden "probably the most unfortunate choice of a Foreign Secretary within living memory."

A number of Tory or National Liberal M.Ps. sent messages of support to the *Anglo-German Review* itself, or for the policy of appeasement it expressed. Those included Sir Ernest Bennett, Sir Thomas Moore and Sir Frank Sanderson, all three of whom I have already mentioned as members of the Anglo-German Fellowship. Then Sir Henry Page Croft, now Lord Croft and Under-Secretary of State for War—Lord "Pike" Croft, the Home Guard call him. Then Major Geoffrey Hutchinson (Ilford), whose contribution to modern thinking is: "We ought to be proud of our rich men and not ashamed of them." He contributed this in a book he wrote pleading for lower taxes on the wealthy. Next Sir John Wardlaw-Milne (Kidderminster), who denied after Munich that we ought to have "a sense of shame . . . because of what has happened." He went on:

"There are those who don't trust Herr Hitler, they say he is a gangster, that he has broken his word several times, and therefore cannot be trusted. . . . It is only fair they should remember that Herr Hitler has made some very definite offers of peace and has proposed definite pacts to other countries, which have not been accepted" (6.10.38).

Thomas Magnay (Gateshead) a National Liberal M.P., is next on the list; then Miss Thelma Cazalet (Mrs. Cazalet Keir, Islington, E.) and Sir John Smedley Crooke (Deritend). As I know very little about some of these M.Ps., I should perhaps point out, in mentioning their writing a letter of support to the *Anglo-German Review*, official organ of the Link, that this does not necessarily mean that they approved all the policy of the *Review* or of the Link.

Sir Smedley Crooke signed, however, another letter; this time to *The Times*. It was signed also by Captain Maule Ramsay (Peebles), last on my list of those who sent messages to the *Anglo-German Review*.

These two Tory M.Ps. signed a letter, signed also by Sir Barry Domville and by Lord Londonderry and Lord Redesdale (father of Miss Unity Mitford), which was printed in *The Times*, 12.10.38, as coming from *The Link*, Link House, Strand, W.C.2. The letter supported the Munich Agreement, which, it said, "gave nothing to Germany which could have been rightfully withheld." (The Munich Agreement, of course, left the Czechs defenceless, and therefore gave Germany, after a few months, the whole of



Czechoslovakia, and enough arms to outweigh all the arms we had made in nearly two years.)

Captain Maule Ramsay has been detained since 1940. As, however, he has not been charged or tried, it is impossible to say for exactly what reason he remains in detention. A mistake in patriotism, perhaps.

Friendship between peoples is a noble ideal. But I have my doubts of the success of the Anglo-German Fellowship in establishing anything but a willingness to listen to Nazi propaganda—which does not normally lead towards friendship between peoples.

Religion is also a great force for good in the world. But I have doubts also about the moral value of the United Christian Front, a small organisation whose chairman was Captain Maule Ramsay. It fought, in his words, “to prove the real fact that General Franco was fighting the cause of Christianity against Anti-christ.” Members of Parliament who joined this “Front” include Captain J. H. F. McEwen (Berwick and Haddington).

Captain McEwen was described by the *Evening Standard* in 1938 as “a dependable man, who will steer in the direction in which the Government want him to go. In October, 1938, in the debate on Munich, he asked a leading question.

“‘Is it not possible for the Hon. gentlemen opposite, as a gesture merely, when they mention their dislike of dictators such as Hitler and Mussolini, to add the name of Stalin? Then we could all agree. . . .’”

Major Patriot agreed. He did not go “all the way” with the Tory M.Ps. who worked for the Anglo-German Fellowship, the Link, the United Christian Front or the other organisations of a similar character. But he was impressed by the energy and decision of his two dozen colleagues who were active in or around these bodies. He felt “they had got something.” And, being what he was, he was very greatly impressed by the names of great business and financial leaders who joined and helped the Fellowship, and by the extraordinary number of Members of the House of Lords associated with it.

Major Patriot was not, of course, a snob. But he had his ambitions, and noted that among the members of the Fellowship there were six lords who had been M.Ps., as well as such great names as the Duke of Wellington, the Marquess of Carisbrooke (grandson of Queen Victoria), the Marquess of Londonderry, the Marquess of Lothian, with five earls, three viscounts and any number of mere lords.

Being told of this pageant of nobility, how could a Patriot fail to be impressed?



*The train at last, and even a seat. Soldiers in the corridor, but he could not help taking the seat, squeezed in four on a side. He must read, learn it by heart, so that he could expose the fellow. If only he could remember who Arnold Wilson was. . . .*

*"No people in our lifetime—none perhaps since the Antonines—have so revered their ruler as do the people of Germany to-day. . . . I can think of but one parallel: that of Alexander, whose army mutinied at Babylon for one more look at their idol and filed in silence before the dying King. . . ."*

*Continually, his bruised mind protested, there was the smell of death through all this book. "A service of remembrance . . . the tribute of the living to the dead." What tribute? What earthly use could the living be to the dead, to the boy far off, unfriended, still?*

*"The leader, watched by some 200,000 persons . . . invoked the living, by the memory of the dead, to be worthy of their land and race."*

*This sham of "race"; he had always hated it!*

*Part of the Major's mind was very busy, throwing up vague phrases of his own patriotic speeches, trying to tell him that he had not been like this fellow whose book he was reading. Another part of his mind walked naked down black, worn, slime-covered stairs of guilt, towards the blacker flood of the river he must avoid.*

## CHAPTER VI

### JUST BEFORE DUNKIRK

And, whilst a field should be despatch'd and fought,  
You are disputing of your generals.  
One would have lingering wars, with little cost;  
Another would fly swift, but wanteth wings;  
A third man thinks, without expense at all,  
By guileful fair words peace may be obtain'd.

SHAKESPEARE, *Henry VI.*

A MONTH BEFORE DUNKIRK, Mr. Duff Cooper said in a speech to an American Club in Paris: "We have found a new way to make war—without sacrificing human lives" (30.4.40).

It is hard now to remember the months of "phoney war," the eight months of 1939 and 1940 in which we were officially at war and actually were under Mr. Chamberlain.

In those months the Tory Party continued in war, or under the camouflage of war, the policy on which it had set its heart during peace. It continued appeasement.



Let us first, for a moment, look at the months before the war. During these months the policy of appeasement included supplying to Germany the goods that the Nazis needed most urgently. Between January and September, 1939, British firms exported 9,577 tons of nickel to Germany. Sir Thomas Inskip, soothing as ever, met protests with the admission that "such exports do help Germany to rearm," but "it is a commercial matter, not within the province of the Government to interfere." The comparable figure for the whole of 1938 was 2,077 tons of nickel exported to Germany.

So in the eight months before this war, as "a commercial matter," we provided our enemies with nearly 1,200 tons per month of this precious war material, as compared with an average of under 175 tons per month in the previous year.

The *News Chronicle* reported on 19.8.39, a fortnight before the war: "The London Rubber Exchange enjoyed almost a record turnover owing to a German order for 4,000 tons. The price shot up. . . . Germany is reported to have bought 17,000 tons already this month—two months' normal consumption."

The *Evening Standard* reported: "To execute the orders in time, heavy withdrawals were made from stores in the United Kingdom. A third of our stocks of rubber and a quarter of our supplies of nickel have gone and are on their way to Germany. All deliveries had to be made before September 1. Mr. Burgin, Minister of Supply, had power to ban the deals, but refused to do so" (21.8.39).

The Rt. Hon. E. Leslie Burgin, LL.D., is National Liberal M.P. for Luton. He was appointed Minister of Supply when that Ministry was established on 1.8.39—about three years after it had first been demanded by the Liberal Party and by Mr. Churchill. He was responsible, in the following months of "phoney war," for a "war effort" that left a million men unemployed.

After "phoney war" had begun, supplies could not be sent directly from Britain to Germany. So our friends the Americans sent them, instead of us: cotton, oil, and all sorts of other war goods suddenly began to flood into Italy (then neutral) and into other countries from which these supplies went direct to the Nazi war factories. And we ourselves gave the Italians most of what they wanted—even if we needed it, even if it was probably going to Germany.

During these months of "phoney war" British Government departments issued licences for the re-export of spruce from Britain to the Caproni firm in Italy. We were short of spruce ourselves; it comes from across the Atlantic. Our merchant seamen



risked or lost their lives to bring it to Britain; we needed it for training planes, and we could have made Mosquito bombers' wing-spars from it—if anyone had allowed de Havilland to make bombers at all at that period. The Italians did make Caproni bombers' wing-spars from it. And less than a year after the issue of these licences, some Capronis were bombing London!

That is what I mean by continuing the policy of appeasement.

Several thousand tons of scrap iron and steel went every month, during this period of "phoney war," from Australia to Japan. Copper and nickel went from Canada to Japan. War materials even went from firms in which the British Government held most of the capital: such a firm is the Anglo-Iranian Oil Co., which contracted in March, 1940, to supply the Japanese with a million barrels of oil.

J. P. W. Mallalieu states, in his lively analysis of our Government departments, *Passed to You, Please*, that "the workers on the night-shift in a department of David Brown's, Huddersfield gear-cutting engineers, found that the blue-prints of some work they were given to do were marked 'Subject to inspection by the Japanese military authorities.' This at the end of 1939, after the war had broken out and Japan had showed her sympathy with the Axis.

"The workers walked straight out of the shop" (p. 124).

While these war materials were being poured into the laps of our enemies, our own production went on in the capitalist way, more attention being paid to profits, present and future, in many of the more important firms—and to the methods of evading Excess Profits Tax—than was paid to getting the maximum out of the men and machines available. One by one—or, on days of special pressure, even two by two—the tanks dribbled out of the workshops of the great firm that has had to-day's Cabinet Minister or yesterday's among its directors—the great firm that was so highly esteemed in Government departments that no rival firm could expect to sell tanks. They dribbled out so slowly, during those eight months, that there were not enough of them to complete a single armoured division in Egypt and a single division in England. So slowly that the armoured division from England never reached Lord Gort's army.

And meanwhile, in the "phoney war," the Navy and the Merchant Navy fought; our Army and Air Force were not permitted to do any fighting—until Hitler was ready.

When Hitler was ready. . . . Norway. Units of the British Army were sent to meet Hitler's forces there. And the Minister of Supply—still Dr. Leslie Burgin—told journalists that he did not



know of any force which had been so splendidly equipped in so short a time.

This is how that equipment was described by Sir Archibald Sinclair, Leader of the Liberal Party, and Secretary for State for Air from the formation of Mr. Churchill's Government to the present day. His description (7.5.40, House of Commons) has never been challenged:

"The Minister of Supply appeared in a Press picture in a becoming white coat, but the troops at Namsos had no white coats at all. Apparently he had the only one. They had no snow-shoes, and if this force were really prepared for Finland it seems incredible that they should have had no snow-shoes, because without them soldiers cannot deploy in deep snow or scatter under air attack or send out patrols to guard their flanks. In the fighting which occurred at Namsos, I understand that men were caught up to their waists in snow. Indeed, it makes me wonder whether the Finnish force really did exist, at any rate on the scale which I understood from the Prime Minister when he talked about the 100,000 men who would be available for Finland and for defending Norway and Sweden from a German counter-stroke.

"These men gave me several examples of deficiencies of equipment, but there are two which I ought to tell the House, of the muddle, waste and confusion, because they ought really to be the subject of inquiry. At one place two anti-aircraft guns were landed. They had an unsuitable type of mounting, they were unprovided with height-finders, they had no means of testing sights, no trained men to work the guns, no fuse keys to set the fuses, no range tables and no trajectory charts. The House will not be surprised if I say that these men told me that the guns were utterly useless.

"The second example relates to a transport. This transport sailed without a chronometer or barometer. It had no international code book and, therefore, no means of communicating with other vessels. It had no arms—not even a rifle. It had no splinter-proof protection, not even a tin hat, and no escort on its return voyage. It had food for less than half the number of men on board and carried a small number of wounded soldiers for whom there was no medical attention or treatment of any kind. Only one in three of the lifeboats could be swung and held outboard—for these there were no water-beakers, so that there would have been no supplies of fresh water if the men had had to take to the boats. They had some charts, but not for the particular Norwegian waters to which the ship was directed. They had no charts for the parts of the North Sea over which they returned on the way home.



"The greatest mystery about this ship is why she ever made the voyage. She carried a certain cargo, and I have worked out the proportions carefully to give the House a picture. The cargo represented an insignificant fraction of her capacity, and stores of this material which she carried existed at her destination, amounting to just under 300 times the amount which she brought. Yet to convoy this absurdly insignificant cargo across the North Sea and to return she burned 350 tons of fuel."

That is the sort of war Mr. Chamberlain was making. In Sir Archibald Sinclair's words, "the Government is giving us a one-shift war while the Germans are working a three-shift war."

Tories, perhaps, might be expected not to listen to Sir Archibald—he is a Liberal. And not to listen to the Labour critics of the Government: that is the Tory idea of national unity. But in the same debate of 7.5.40 Mr. Amery spoke—a true-blue Tory, a real reactionary if ever there was one. He said:

"There is no doubt that during these eight months,<sup>1</sup> thanks to Germany's flying start and our slowness off the mark, the gap between the German forces and ours has widened enormously as far as troops, their equipment, tanks, guns and all the paraphernalia of land warfare are concerned. It has widened in the air. . . .

"The Norwegian chapter . . . is a bad story, a story of lack of prevision and of preparation, a story of indecision, slowness and fear of taking risks. If only it stood alone. Unfortunately, it does not. It is only of a piece with the rest of it, of a piece with our hesitation and slowness in responding to Finland's appeals for arms, in our handling of economic warfare and the reorganisation of industry, of our retraining of our workers, of the production of the essential munitions of war, of agriculture—in fact, the whole of our national effort, which, according to the Chancellor of the Exchequer, is apparently to be at most 10 per cent higher in the course of this year than it is to-day."

That is the sort of thing even Tory M.Ps. might have listened to—salted to their taste with the right feeling about Finland, the Tories' disappointment that they had not done more against Russia.

And during the next day's debate Herbert Morrison gave them a chance to know how the world outside Britain thought of the smug apathy of Chamberlain's Government, which—said the *New York Herald Tribune*, a paper so pro-British, normally, that the British Press quotes it more than any other New York paper—"has been so consistently out-manœuvred, and has arrived too

<sup>1</sup> The eight months of "phoney war," 1939-40.



late on so many occasions." Mr. Morrison also quoted the *Sydney Sun*, Australia's best-known newspaper:

"What has been revealed is so shocking in its implications of deficient preparations for an emergency that Mr. Chamberlain's complacent outlook evokes the gravest doubts throughout the Empire of the Government's capacity to put the necessary drive into the war effort."

The Tory M.Ps. were not without information. They knew how weakly, with what doddering futility of cross-purposes, the "war effort" was being directed. Yet the great majority of them voted for Mr. Chamberlain: 281 out of just over 300 Tory and "national" M.Ps. attending that session.

They voted, that is to say, three weeks before Dunkirk, two days before the German Panzer divisions crashed into Holland, Belgium and France, to keep Mr. Chamberlain in supreme power, and to keep Mr. Churchill in a job that has—since May, 1930—been done to the satisfaction of most people by a leader of the Co-operatives.

Why did they vote for this old gentleman from the Birmingham hardware trade, when Mr. Chamberlain "called on his friends to support us in the lobby to-night"?

Perhaps because of the soothing-syrup merchants. I shall quote a few. Perhaps, in some cases, for other reasons.

From one point of view, at least, Britain was doing very well. "Mr. Chamberlain," once said Mr. Lloyd George, "views everything through the wrong end of a municipal drain-pipe." Some Tory M.Ps., deeply enmeshed in business affairs, may have had an equivalent shortsightedness: they saw the world in terms of company balance-sheets. And trade was doing very nicely, thank you.

Major Patriot could not help feeling that the criticism of Mr. Chamberlain was unjust. The Prime Minister might be a little slow, but he was safe. He would pull the country through. . . . After all, industry is the country, in a way. Look at the way Mr. Chamberlain had got the industries that mattered on their feet. . . .

Major Patriot had some personal knowledge. In 1935 he had made a speech at a dinner of a trade association, echoing Sir Samuel Hoare's great words at Geneva: that the British Government's support for the League of Nations was "the keynote of its foreign policy . . . the collective maintenance of the Covenant . . . particularly for steady and collective resistance to all acts of unprovoked aggression. The attitude of the British nation in the last few weeks has clearly demonstrated the fact that this is no



variable sentiment, but a principle of international conduct to which they and their Government hold with firm, enduring and universal persistence." (11.9.35—three months before Sir Samuel Hoare, and M. Laval, offered the Italians two-thirds of Abyssinia, against which country they were engaged upon unprovoked aggression.)

After Major Patriot had finished his speech praising the League and promising peace, a friend came up and said: "I couldn't help applauding, but every time you make speeches like that my shares go down again."

"Shares in what?" asked our M.P.

"In Beardmore's—the big engineers. £1 shares, nominally—they're priced under fivepence each at the moment; they've been down as far as threepence, this year."

And Major Patriot, who had inherited some money from an aunt, was so carried away by his own enthusiasm for the National Government's prosperity plans that he agreed, after some discussion, to buy 10,000 of these shares at 4½d. each.

Next year, to his delight, they were worth 9s. a share. (That, he felt, was the reward of virtue for speaking so well and so getting elected again and so reassuring the public about peace and prosperity. It's all a matter of confidence). In this case, confidence had given him £4,300 profit on an investment of under £200. And the shares kept on climbing. I forget what they were when, in May, 1940, Major Patriot had to decide whether to vote for Mr. Chamberlain or to vote for a change. They are about 27s. 6d. now. They were not important to his income—but they were significant, somewhere at the back of his mind. They represented pessimism proved wrong; they were a bet that he had won against the doubters. He did not realise how much they, and other small investments of his—rising so cheerfully—affected his outlook.

And the bigger investments of other people soaked through to him, from the attitude of his colleagues. There were men in the House who had spotted, in 1935, the value of aircraft shares. Nine aircraft companies had been sold to the public for £7,611,082. Of that amount £5,223,160—nearly 70 per cent—went in profits to company promoters and Stock Exchange firms. And the shares had jumped in value by another £3 million odd as soon as they came on the market.

If you need, reader, to amaze yourself with all these rows of 000,000s,—the million figures that mean Park Lane and country houses and the chance to marry "county"—try to find a scandalous little book called *Rats!*, by "The Pied Piper." After you have read it, you will realise how hard it was, in May, 1940,



for those who were "doing nicely" to feel that something big was wrong.

Yet something very big was wrong. Sixty or seventy German divisions were poised for the six-week campaign that would destroy France, and drive into the sea our gallant but under-equipped seven divisions. Dunkirk was very near.

All the M.Ps. listed in the next chapter voted for Mr. Chamberlain to remain in office in the division of 8.5.40.

So did many of those I have already mentioned in this book. I do not list those already mentioned elsewhere, in the following chapter, because I have put an index of M.Ps. at the back of the book which will tell you how most Tory M.Ps. voted on this and other issues.

Two hundred and eighty Tory and National Liberal M.Ps. voted for Mr. Chamberlain to stay. Ask your local Tory about it—he may have a better explanation than mine.

*Painfully, the broken man read on: after the parades and the rites of Nuremberg, the "Leader" dedicating his "virile, brave and honourable" people to their tasks, came the comment:*

*"Reading accounts in the British daily and weekly newspapers of this and other ceremonies, I was struck at what seemed to me the almost scornful cynicism of some, and nervous apprehension of other, writers. Some special correspondents of great daily papers were at pains to belittle what they had witnessed, to ascribe it to incurable turpitude, impenitent militarism, or indomitable pride. . . ."*

*But they were trying to warn us! cried part of his mind. And because he was ill and cold and wretched, in that train, going to break an ageing woman's heart, part of his mind said also: "They were trying to warn me."*

*And he remembered, with a feeling of surprise, that he had not been warned. He had done only what the others did; why did he deserve . . . ? But it was true; he had not taken the warning. He had voted as the others did: and so these boys were almost without arms, without allies, on the flare-lit beach of Dunkirk. Was it because of Dunkirk that the image of a dark tide, and a corpse floating by, was always in his mind?*



## CHAPTER VII

### MR. CHAMBERLAIN'S FRIENDS

"The last five years—five years of futile good intention, five years of eager search for the line of least resistance, five years of uninterrupted retreat of British power, five years of neglect of our air defences.

"We have been reduced in those five years from a position of security so overwhelming and so unchallengeable that we never cared to think about it.

"When I think of the fair hopes of a long peace which still lay before Europe at the beginning of 1933 when Herr Hitler first obtained power, and of all the opportunities of arresting this growth of the Nazi power which have been thrown away, when I think of the immense combinations and resources which have been neglected or squandered, I cannot believe that a parallel exists in the whole course of history.

"So far as this country is concerned, the responsibility must rest with those who have the undisputed control of our political affairs."—WINSTON CHURCHILL, 5.10.38, House of Commons.

THE FIRST TWO M.Ps. I pick, out of those who voted for Mr. Chamberlain and a nice quiet war, represent the alliance that makes the Tory Party what it is.

I leave out the ABCs, dealt with at some length in my first three chapters, and begin with Mr. C. Drewe (Honiton), who was educated at Eton and Woolwich, and farms his own land near Honiton, where the Drewes have resided since 1592. He represents the lords of land, still a powerful constituent part of Toryism.

The Rt. Hon. Sir Andrew Duncan (City of London), Minister of Supply, is as typical of modern industry as Mr. Drewe is of our old county families. He was Chairman of the Steel Federation and director of the Bank of England. He represents in this list the lords of industry and finance, first among our modern rulers.

Walter Elliot (Kelvingrove) was the Minister of Agriculture who did more than any other man to "stabilise" that great industry—by handing over the land of our country to the thistles. His policy was one of restriction, of "levies" on what



was produced in order to keep production down and, if possible, drive prices up a bit.

Farmers, under his policy, did less farming, and more form-filling. A Scottish Farmers' League formed to combat this policy described it, picturesquely, as "no more use to the industry than the 'p' in pneumonia."

As the living forces of our land were being gripped and smothered, a plan emerged:

"If one wants to do a new thing in this country," said Walter Elliot, "one must do it as if it were an old thing. For that reason it seems to me to be courting failure to tell people that they have first to dress themselves up in black shirts and throw their opponents downstairs in order to get the corporative State. . . . This new economic order, the corporative State, has already developed further in England than is generally realised" (quoted by Sir Stafford Cripps in his *National Fascism in Britain*, p. 5).

The corporative—or, more usually, the corporate—State is, of course, the economic organisation of Fascism and of National Socialism.

After doing his best with agriculture, Walter Elliot became Secretary of State for Scotland, which under his care became the most "depressed" area in Britain. Then he became Minister of Health, and spent much of his time trying to make up his mind if it was politically safe to cut down the social services that come under that Ministry. He said, according to the *News Chronicle*, 16.11.38:

"It may be that we shall have to make inroads in these great social services" (28.10.38).

"It is our intention that the social services should be maintained and expanded" (31.10.38).

"I say without hesitation that to pretend to our democracy that there is no danger to be feared to all our standards in this enormous outpouring of wealth on war and preparation for war is a pretence of which I, for one, do not intend to be a party" (14.11.38).

Replying at Walsall, to statements that the Government would make cuts in the social services: "I am here, as Minister of Social Services, to say that it is a lie" (15.11.38).

Mr. Elliot is considered a most progressive Tory.

Major Sir Cyril Entwistle (Bolton) is chairman of five companies.

Squadron-Leader Eric Errington (Bootle) was principal beneficiary under the will of a relative who left almost a quarter of a million pounds.



Colonel A. G. Erskine-Hill (Edinburgh, N.) was in 1940 elected Chairman of the 1922 Committee, now the Conservative Private Members' Committee. The 1922 Committee was of great importance in 1940 after the formation of Mr. Churchill's Government, for the Government had taken powers to conscript property, when necessary, as well as conscripting men and women. The 1922 Committee was one of the principal organisations that saw to it that property should not be conscripted, however much the nation might need it.

Sir Gifford Fox (Henley) paid £5,000 to Lord Airlie for the rent of a moor to shoot over in the 1937 season. That was the year in which the Tory Government began to work out an A.R.P. programme for our cities, and decided that there was not enough money available for deep shelters.

Sir Arnold Gridley (Stockport), director of electrical power and other companies, including tin, rubber, oil and finance companies, is one of the spokesmen of those who think that the Beveridge Plan means the spending "of an immense sum over and above that which is required for meeting real want."

Colonel the Hon. Henry Guest (Plymouth, Drake) and Major the Hon. Oscar Guest (Camberwell, N.W.) are brothers who belong to the family which helped to found Guest, Keen and Nettlefolds, a £12 million company of which the Hon. Henry is a director. He is also a director of Powell Duffryn Associated Collieries, which is the biggest combine in the British coal industry.

The Guests are related by marriage to the Hon. Oliver Lyttelton, who entered politics and the Cabinet during this war. Before the war he was a London director of the Metallgesellschaft, one of Germany's biggest industrial firms, which has already been mentioned (p. 46. Captain Lyttelton was not M.P. in May, 1940, and therefore did not vote at that time for Mr. Chamberlain.)

A neat account of how the Guests began their industrial and political careers, became nineteenth-century peers and twentieth-century viscounts, married into the older peerage and bought scores of thousands of acres of land, is in *Tory M.P.*, by Simon Haxey. One of this great family was made Viscount Wimborne in 1918. The town out of which their fortunes first grew, Merthyr Tydvil, became almost derelict between the two great wars, unemployment reaching the 40 per cent level.

The Rt. Hon. Sir Douglas Hacking (Chorley) was Chairman of the Conservative Party organisation from 1936 till 1942. Previous to that, he was Vice-President of the Hotels and Restaurants Association; he led the opposition, in 1943, to the Government's Catering Bill—a small measure of social justice



which, Mr. Bevin declared, was necessary for the proper organisation of catering in wartime. But it might, of course, slightly affect hotel profits.

He is also one of the founders of a new organisation, the National League for Freedom, which aims at the abolition of government controls over trade and industry—that is, it wants freedom for monopolists of all sorts.

M. R. Hely-Hutchinson (Hastings) expressed in the Commons on 9.11.38, his—

“Wholehearted support of the new spirit of minding our own business which has informed out foreign policy since my Rt. Hon. Friend the Prime Minister [Mr. Chamberlain] assumed the full direction of it. . . . If the statesmen of foreign nations . . . find it impossible to mind their own business, why that, after all, is not our business.”

The *Daily Mail*, 9.4.41, printed the following:

“Although he has a four-figure income, merchant-banker Mr. M. R. Hely-Hutchinson says that the new taxation will leave him with only about 5s. a week spending money for each of his family.

“He has just been elected a director of the National Provincial Bank, which will bring him in £1,333 a year, and is his twelfth directorship. Without this appointment, his gross income was very nearly in the five-figure region.

“‘After paying income tax and super-tax,’ he says, ‘the cost of the education which I am under contract to provide for my children, insurance for my wife and family in case I die, rent, rates and maintenance of my London home, now untenanted, and my political expenses, I am left with about £9 per week, i.e., £1 per week per head for each of our family as *spending* money. As a result of the new Budget, that £1 a week will be reduced to 4s.’

“Out of his salary for the new appointment he will pay £1,050 in taxes, leaving him £283. As his Town house is shut up, and he is now living in Scotland with his family, and as a director of the National Provincial Bank is obliged to be on duty in London whole-time in alternate weeks, he will have to have a flat in London, which he estimates will cost about £250 per annum, leaving him £33; which will add about 1s. per week to the spending money for each of his family.

“‘Four years ago I had a house in the country,’ he said, ‘a house in London, three cars, five horses, and a private shoot. . . . I don’t want to pretend that I am carrying on from a sense of duty alone. I am also hoping that taxes will not always be so high as they are now’—aren’t we all?”



R. Jennings (Hallam) was elected at a by-election during the period of Mr. Chamberlain's rearmament programme. He said during his campaign, according to the *Daily Mail*:

"The National Government's policy is peace, preparedness, and progress. I stand for a country strongly equipped for defence. . . .

"As an Englishman through and through, I place my country first every time and all the time." (27.4.37.)

It may be useful at this point to remind readers that the M.Ps. mentioned in this chapter voted to keep Mr. Chamberlain in power, two days before the fighting began that ended at Dunkirk.

Sir John Graham Kerr (Scottish Universities) is one of those who would like to limit the right of the people, even in peacetime, to know what happens in Parliament. *The Times* reported, 14.12.38, that he had refused an invitation of members of Glasgow University to discuss the Government's foreign policy with them. He replied that: "in his personal judgment discussions on foreign policy were apt to do harm rather than good. It was, in his opinion, one of the greatest faults of our Parliamentary system that it permitted unrestricted discussion of foreign affairs in open debate. There was no reform he would more gladly see than the institution of a Foreign Affairs Committee representative of all parties, to which Parliament would delegate the discussion of foreign affairs *in camera* with the Ministers concerned."

*In camera* means in secret.

W. S. Liddall (Lincoln) was described as Chairman, just before this war began, of the "Loyalty to Leader group of Conservative M.Ps." (*Evening Standard*, 21.7.39).

Of Sir George Mitcheson (St. Pancras, S.W.), the *Evening Standard* wrote on 16.6.40:

"Sir George Mitcheson . . . is a solicitor who went into the business of motor-car production. Then he extended his interests in the City. He is rich now. Very rich indeed.

"George Mitcheson became Sir George on account of the fund he was able to collect in the City (in cash and kind) to help the National Government win the last General Election. . . ."

J. P. Morris (Salford, N.) is one of those who believed so strongly in appeasement that he resented any effort to wake this country up to the dangers approaching. He asked Mr. Chamberlain in the Commons on 6.3.39 if he was aware "that certain organs of the Press, during the past few years, had continually published alarming statements regarding the international situation, which in many cases were grossly exaggerated, and in others false.



"He asked if Mr. Chamberlain would consider introducing legislation imposing penalties for the publication of demonstrably fake news which resulted in causing anxiety and loss to the business community, the Stock Exchange, and the general public" (*Daily Express*, 7.3.39).

The Rt. Hon. Sir Hugh O'Neill (Antrim) belongs to one of the most ancient and famous families in Ireland. In November, 1938, after Munich, the *Yorkshire Post* reported that "the signatures of back-bench M.Ps. are being sought this evening by Sir Hugh O'Neill for a Memorial expressing thanks to the Prime Minister [Mr. Chamberlain] for his work for peace."

E. A. Radford (Rusholme) is a good business man. In a debate on the Budget in 1938 he admitted that on one point he was an interested party, being a director of an alcohol-petrol distributing company, but went on to plead against the discouraging of a young industry by special taxation of alcohol-petrol. Sir John Simon, the Chancellor of the Exchequer replied:

"I hope that a tax of a little over a penny on each gallon of the particular mixture which he [Mr. Radford] is interested in will not entirely destroy the fortunes of a company which I understand last year made a larger amount of profit than the whole of its paid-up capital" (*Daily Express*, 28.5.38).

The company referred to was the Petroleum Storage and Finance Company, which, according to the *Daily Express*, paid 344 per cent dividend on their 1s. Deferred Shares, which had risen in value on the Stock Exchange to 25s. each. In three years this company made a £1,000,000 profits on a capital of £475,000.

Mr. Radford referred to the *Daily Express* exposure as "contemptible and scurrilous"—but did not deny any of the facts quoted (*Daily Express*, 24.6.38).

H. V. A. M. Raikes (Essex, S.E.), the great-grandson of Lord Dinsdale, claimed after Munich that Mr. Chamberlain "will go down in history as the greatest European statesman of this or any time." On March 19, 1940, after over six months of "phoney war," he said in the Commons he was appalled at the idea that "if Germany does not attack us, we must take the initiative."

He went on:

"Foreseeing as I do a long war, a war which, I think, will destroy many of the things which most of us have been brought up to value, a war which may leave, long afterwards, its scar and its strain upon this country, I should almost be tempted to urge a negotiated settlement were it not for the fact that I believe we are fighting against the greatest forces of evil which have been known in the world for many years. . . ."



Mr. Raikes is a member of the Imperial Policy Group, which will be described later.

J. Roland Robinson (Blackpool) married a Woolworth heiress. Of his son the *Daily Express* wrote as follows, on 26.5.43:

"The 'Luckiest Baby,' 10-weeks old Richard Anthony Gasque Robinson, is already a successful financier—by proxy.

"'He is wealthy all in his own right,' said his mother. 'When he was born his father took out five life insurance policies in his name. Then his two grandmothers and an aunt started bank accounts for him. Not content with that, his father bought some shares in his name, held them until they rose in value, and sold them again, and the proceeds were banked for him.'"

Sir Waldron Smithers (Chislehurst), a member of the Stock Exchange, was very worried when the Soviet Union first proposed to join the League of Nations.

"The League will become the prey of the Bolsheviks," he said; "they will use Geneva as a valuable world forum for their policy of disorder, revolution and misery" (*Morning Post*, 10.7.34).

The Rt. Hon. Sir Donald Somervell (Crewe), Solicitor-General when Hitler came to power and Attorney-General now, praised Mr. Chamberlain's "fairness and firmness," which had "eased the tension in Europe" in 1938.

Commander Sir Archibald Southby (Epsom) thanked Mr. Chamberlain after Munich, recognised the sacrifices made by the Czechs, and went on that we should recognise also "the efforts made for peace by Signor Mussolini and Herr Hitler. . . ."

He expressed belief in the "sincerity" of Hitler and Mussolini, to both of whom—he assured the House—"peace for their people is an essential."

"I pay my tribute to what Signor Mussolini has done. He has, for example, done something to help the people to reclaim swamps. . . ."

Sir Archibald Southby was one of Mr. Chamberlain's most fervent defenders in the debate after Norway—the debate at the end of which he and so many Tory M.Ps. expressed in their votes a preference for Mr. Chamberlain as Prime Minister rather than Mr. Churchill. He said:

"It was not British incompetence which led to the British failure in Norway. It was Norwegian treachery." (Hon. Members: "Shame.") "Treachery of Norwegian officials. . . . What real cause is there for blame? If people inside and outside this House are going to squeal every time there is some minor setback." (An Hon. Member: "We are not squealing.")



"We have taken a minor knock in Norway. Do not let us be cast down."

The Rt. Hon. Oliver Stanley (Westmorland) is the political hope of a great family. His ancestors, the fourteenth, fifteenth, sixteenth and seventeenth Earls of Derby—the second earldom in the Kingdom in order of precedence—were all Cabinet Ministers. His elder brother, Lord Edward Stanley, was not only a Cabinet Minister; he was Deputy Chairman of the Tory Party. His sister married twice; both husbands were Conservative M.P.s.; her daughter married another M.P., the son and heir of Lord Halifax.

Oliver Stanley married the daughter of the Marquess of Londonderry, who was in the Cabinet from 1931 to 1935. Lord Londonderry was and is a great coal-owner; he was a great advocate of friendship with Hitler's Germany.

There has to be a Stanley in the Cabinet, whenever possible. The present one has tried the Home Office, as Under-Secretary—a two-year apprenticeship; then the Ministry of Transport, as Minister, for a year; the Ministry of Labour when the Means Test for the unemployed was introduced—a measure that did more to break up family life in Britain than any previous piece of legislation.

Then he moved on to Education for a year or two, was President of the Board of Trade during Mr. Chamberlain's "rearmament," and found himself Secretary of State for War in 1940.

He had to answer, for the Government, on May 8, 1940, the devastating criticisms I have quoted, in the previous chapter, about the Norwegian failure. He explained that he and his advisers had not expected the Germans to land where they did, and went on:

"Hon. Members will realise it was necessary to reconnoitre the neighbourhood of Trondheim to ascertain whether there were in fact ports where it was possible with any hope of success to land a force of the sort of magnitude necessary. The only known ports, of course, had already been taken [by the Germans]. As a result of these reconnaissances, we did discover Namsos and Andalsnes."

These were the two little fishing ports at which our troops landed in Norway. Stanley complained that there was only one crane at one of these ports, and none at the other. The revelation that the British Government had to send "trained officers" to Norway, to "survey the possibilities" of these ports that they had "discovered," was a shock to those few Members of the House who know how to read a chart. They realised that all the necessary information about Namsos and Andalsnes could have been obtained by an officer crossing the road from the War Office and calling in opposite at the Admiralty. . . .



So the miserable story dribbled on. Our Territorials, who landed first, had not been intended for more than protection of the ports they landed at. (They were fighting Germany's best regular troops the day after they landed.) "Adequate air support" proved "quite impossible." The evacuation was ordered. . . .

I promised in a previous chapter to give some of the arguments of those who spoke soothingly. I doubt if Oliver Stanley's speech comes under that heading.

Colonel Sir Lambert Ward (Hull) in 1938 condemned the Czechs for "reckless treaty-making" which brought about "the encirclement of Germany," which he also condemned.

On 29.3.40—after seven months of war—he spoke to the Hull Rotary Club:

"The only hope I can see at present of a peace approaching permanency is that it should be negotiated rather than dictated, and that it should be guaranteed by the United States and other powerful nations" (*Daily Express*, 30.3.40).

Three others should be quoted to show the level of argument used by those who spoke as Mr. Chamberlain's friends just before Dunkirk. One is Lord Croft, the advocate of pikes as weapons for modern warfare, whom I have mentioned earlier in this book; he was then Tory M.P. for Bournemouth. The two others are National Liberal M.Ps. to-day.

Brigadier-General Sir Henry Page-Croft, as he then was, considered that the important thing about the Norwegian fighting was that we had won a naval victory! He was so impressed with this naval victory—"an epic story"—that he called it "the first decisive strategic stroke of the war." He asked:

"How is it, within three weeks of that tremendous strategic gain, that we suddenly find that certain elements in this country are being rendered despondent?"

And he answered the question:

"A fortnight after that strategic victory, certain people and writers in the Press have enrolled themselves definitely under Dr. Goebbels in what can only be described as a defeatist campaign. . . . A minor technical mishap . . . has been magnified into a great disaster to British arms."

He went on to suggest that Hitler had weakened Germany's position in the war by "extending the German right flank by a thousand miles."

And his final description of the criticism of Chamberlain and his Government was: "This unfair sabotage."

Lewis Jones, National Liberal M.P. for Swansea West, had



made careful enquiries in the country and discovered that the "continuous political 'barracking' which is going on is sapping the will and determination of hundreds of thousands of brave men and women." And he characterised the criticism of Chamberlain as "political intrigue."

The Rt. Hon. George Lambert, National Liberal M.P. for South Molton, repeated this point, and repeated also Page-Croft's kind reference to Goebbels. He said:

"These acrimonious debates are undermining the strength of the country by undermining confidence in those who have the direction of affairs.

"I listened in the early days of the war to a gentleman who was called Lord Haw-Haw. He tried to sap our confidence. That is what is happening to-day. Dr. Goebbels could not have done better than the House of Commons has done."

It will be seen how closely these arguments fit together. What the House of Commons was discussing was—as events proved—whether those responsible for the disastrous muddles of the first part of the war should take a back seat. And these friends of Mr. Chamberlain complained that the critics—who helped to put Mr. Churchill in power—were doing Goebbels' work for him.

I have mentioned thirty Tory and National Liberal M.Ps., in this chapter, who decided to remain Mr. Chamberlain's friends until the feeling of this country, expressed through the Press, the Labour and Liberal parties, and the revolt of a small number of Tories, forced them to make a quick change and become—on the surface at least—Mr. Churchill's friends. Here are a hundred more who voted for Mr. Chamberlain that day:

Lt.-Col. G. Acland-Troyte (Tiverton).  
Rear-Admiral T. Beamish (Lewes).  
Sir Reginald Blair (Hendon).  
A. C. Bossom (Maidstone).  
W. W. Boulton (Sheffield, Central).  
Sir Edmund Brocklebank (Fairfield).  
H. Brooke (Lewisham, W.).  
Rt. Hon. Ernest Brown (Leith).  
Sir Samuel Chapman (Edinburgh, S.).  
Colonel Ralph Clarke (East Grinstead).  
N. C. D. Colman (Brixton).  
Douglas Cooke (Hammersmith, S.).  
Viscountess Davidson (Hemel Hempstead).  
Major Sir George Davies (Yeovil).  
J. A. L. Duncan (Kensington, N.).



Major Sir James Edmondson (Banbury).  
     Sir Geoffrey Ellis (Ecclesall).  
 Captain G. S. Eliston (Blackburn).  
     Ralph Etherton (Stretford).  
 Sir Granville Gibson (Pudsey and Otley).  
 Captain A. C. Graham (Chester, Wirral).  
     W. P. C. Greene (Worcester).  
     R. V. Grimston (Westbury).  
     H. P. Harland (Belfast, E.).  
 Lt.-Col. A. P. Heneage (Louth).  
     J. Hepworth (Bradford, E.).  
     W. F. Higgs (Birmingham, W.).  
 Miss Florence Horsburgh (Dundee).  
 Sir Austen Hudson (Hackney, N.).  
     Sir George Hume (Greenwich).  
     T. Hunter (Perth).  
     Sir Percy Hurd (Devizes).  
 Major L. Kimball (Loughborough).  
     Sir Joseph Lamb (Stone).  
     J. Lees-Jones (Blackley).  
 Major B. E. P. Leighton (Oswestry).  
     T. Levy (Elland).  
     O. Lewis (Colchester).  
     The Rev. J. Little (Down).  
 Colonel the Rt. Hon. J. L. Llewellyn (Uxbridge).  
     Rt. Hon. G. W. Lloyd (Ladywood).  
 Major Sir Jocelyn Lucas (Portsmouth, S.).  
 Colonel Sir Charles MacAndrew (Bute and North Ayr).  
     M. S. McCorquodale (Sowerby).  
     J. H. H. McKie (Galloway).  
     Sir Adam Maitland (Faversham).  
 Brigadier-General Sir E. Makins (Knutsford).  
     Lt.-Col. John Mayhew (East Ham, N.).  
     Sir John Mellor (Tamworth).  
     Colonel Sir Joseph Nall (Hulme).  
     Lt.-Col. Basil Nield (Chester).  
 I. L. Orr-Ewing (Weston-super-Mare).  
     G. E. H. Palmer (Winchester).  
     C. U. Peat (Darlington).  
 K. W. M. Pickthorn (Cambridge University).  
     Captain L. F. Plugge (Chatham).  
     Colonel C. E. Ponsonby (Sevenoaks).  
     Major H. A. Proctor (Accrington).  
     L. R. Pym (Monmouth).



Sir Robert Rankin (Kirkdale).  
     A. C. Reed (Exeter).  
     Sir Stanley Reed (Aylesbury).  
 The Rt. Hon. J. S. C. Reid (Hillhead).  
 Major Sir Ronald Ross (Londonderry).  
 Admiral Sir Percy Royds (Kingston).  
     E. W. Salt (Yardley).  
     H. R. Selley (Battersea, S.).  
     Captain W. T. Shaw (Forfar).  
     Sir E. Shepperson (Leominster).  
     Bracewell Smith (Dulwich).  
     Sir Robert Smith (Aberdeen, Central).  
     Sir Waldron Smithers (Chislehurst).  
 W. R. Snadden (Kinross and West Perth).  
     S. Storey (Sunderland).  
     H. G. Strauss (Norwich).  
     Captain W. F. Strickland (Coventry).  
 The Rt. Hon. James Stuart (Moray and Nairn).  
     Harold Sutcliffe (Royton).  
     Sir Robert Tasker (Holborn).  
 Vice-Admiral E. A. Taylor (Paddington, S.)  
     J. P. L. Thomas (Hereford).  
     Sir Douglas Thomson (Aberdeen, S.).  
 Major G. E. P. Thorneycroft (Stafford).  
     G. C. Touche (Reigate).  
 Lt.-Commander R. L. Tufnell (Cambridge).  
     W. W. Wakefield (Swindon).  
     Miss Irene Ward (Wallsend).  
     Captain C. Waterhouse (Leicester, S.).  
 Brigadier G. S. Harvie Watt (Richmond).  
     Sir William Wayland (Canterbury).  
     Sir Harold Webbe (Abbey).  
     Sir Richard Wells (Bedford).  
     W. Garfield Weston (Macclesfield).  
     Sir Dymoke White (Fareham).  
     Commander C. Williams (Torquay).  
     Lt.-Col. G. Windsor-Clive (Ludlow).  
     H. Wragg (Belper).  
     A. S. L. Young (Glasgow, Partick).

They voted for Chamberlain, even in May, 1940. It is a long list. It could be more than twice as long. I have left out most of those described in other chapters. They can be traced in the Index of M.Ps., with some of their other votes.



But I doubt if any vote they have ever given was as important, and as revealing, as this one. The fact that they did not succeed in keeping Chamberlain in power—and therefore did not succeed in handing us over, incompetent and bound and helpless, to Hitler—is not their fault. It is ours. The people of Britain showed they would not stand for it. But that fact does not absolve Mr. Chamberlain's friends.

*He was coming towards the end of the book. It held him, though exhaustion was pulling him down into a stiff, frightened sleep. The Nuremberg Party Congress again, next year, 1937:*

*"A more confident but not more aggressive note.*

*"Herr Hitler appeared to me, when he received a number of foreign guests one afternoon, to have mellowed. The note of urgency, of passionate desire no longer to be misunderstood abroad and to gain the allegiance of doubters at home, had given place to one of sober confidence."*

*Then praise for Franco's Spain. Over the last few pages, the reader fell asleep.*

## CHAPTER VIII

### PROPERTY'S PATRIOTS

"The monstrous modern doctrine of the Rights of Man . . . threatens to overturn the government, law, property, security, religion, order, and everything valuable in this country, as it has already overturned and destroyed everything in France, and endangered every nation in Europe. . . .

"That great moving principle of all Jacobinism, the love of plunder, devastation and robbery, which now bears the usurped name of liberty . . . the arrogant claims of the same class of men as those who lord it now in France, to trample upon the rich, and crush all; the dark designs of a few, making use of the name of the people to govern all; a plan founded in the arrogance of wretches, the outcasts of society. . . ."—PITT, moving in the Commons the introduction of a Bill suspending *Habeas Corpus*, 16.5.1794.

IN MAY AND JUNE, 1940, France fell; we were nearer to invasion by a foreign enemy than we had been for hundreds of years.

The new Government, Churchill plus the leaders of Labour and of Liberalism, with some of the "old gang" in positions



where they seemed harmless, was a Government of national unity. Throughout the country men and women worked as they had never worked before; the Home Guard trained with desperate eagerness; the factories clanged and strained to make good the time wasted, the years of indecision.

In the House of Commons a promise was given, and powers were taken, by Mr. Attlee on behalf of the new Government. He said on May 22, 1940:

"We must mobilise to the full the resources of the country. We must throw all our weight into the struggle. Every private interest must give way to the urgent needs of the community. . . .

"It is necessary that the Government should be given complete control over persons and property, not just some persons of some particular class of the community, but of all persons, rich and poor, employer and workman, man or woman, and all property. . . .

"Let me deal with a few points about control over property. Some establishments will be controlled altogether right away. Others may be controlled later. They will, in effect, be working on Government account. Wages and profits will be under Government control. The Excess Profits Tax will be at the rate of 100 per cent. There will be no profit out of the national emergency."

The emergency powers asked for were granted almost without debate, and without a division.

None of the opponents of Socialism, none of those who believe in "private enterprise," spoke against this emergency Socialism, this decision—and promise—to conscript property as the nation needed it, in the same way that lives were being conscripted.

Yet the promise was never carried out. Firms were controlled; yes. Many were steadily tied up in more and more red tape. Industries were "concentrated," and firms closed down. But there was no conscription of the great industries the nation needed. The Tories saw to that.

The day that Mr. Attlee made his promise the *Daily Herald* wrote joyfully:

"This means that, in general, no profits will be made out of the war by anybody. . . . We rejoice in the part which Labour leaders have played to bring about the revolution in the national economy"—(22.5.40).

Ten weeks later the City Editor of the *Daily Herald* wrote:

"The idea that the 100 per cent Excess Profits Duty is limiting dividends is complete nonsense. In this sense, 100 per cent Excess Profits Duty is a fraud"—(11.8.40).



Profits went on. They increased. I shall not drag you, reader, through those weary pages of 000,000s that you can find in half a dozen books, or in the pages of the *Economist*. Let us take first two examples, one from coal and one from railways.

Doncaster Amalgamated Collieries announced £215,650 gross profit in 1939, and £427,830 gross profit in 1940. After E.P.T. had been duly paid, a bank loan of over £100,000 paid off, another £100,000 put to reserve, the net profit available to shareholders was more than double, in 1940, what it was in 1939.

Then take the British railways as a whole—excluding those operated by the London Transport Board. The nation, for war purposes, needed the railways. It did not take them—as it takes ordinary men's lives. It did not give the shareholders pocket money if they needed it, or a pension of £2 a week or so, as the nation gives its crippled soldiers. It agreed to pay the railway companies 43 million pounds a year. If the railways had been restricted, as other concerns are supposed to be under E.P.T., to the profits made in a standard year, they would have kept, as profits for their shareholders, only about £31,500,000.

"It guarantees," said a Labour M.P. of the Government's proposal, "a profit of £43,000,000 to the existing owners while leaving the entire direction of the whole industry in the hands of the existing owners."—Mr. Ridley (Clay Cross), 22.10.41.

Colonel Sir George Courthope (Rye) answered for the Tories that:

"The stockholders are not all in one class, as there are debenture holders, guaranteed stockholders and so on, and a great many of the preferred ordinary stockholders and deferred ordinary stockholders will not get anything under the Agreement."

He did not say how long it was since these shareholders received any dividend in peacetime.

The railways are grossly over-capitalised; their nominal capital has been "watered." When the Government needed them, it took control of them—yet left the ownership (and the right to appoint managers) to the companies.

The key point in all the muddles, the over-control and under-production of so many of our war industries, was put very simply by another Labour M.P., Mr. George Daggar (Abertillery), two months later in the Commons. He said:

"Is not State control ineffective at present because ownership is lacking? You cannot effectively plan other people's property" (4.12.41).

And in the same speech he pointed out that the party with a



majority in the Commons not only insisted on keeping property almost entirely intact in the hands of its present owners, while conscripting men and women for fighting and for work; this party also insisted on resisting the lesser changes that would ease the lives of our conscript people, and increase their hope and morale and therefore their production:

“What about an increase in soldiers’ pay and dependents’ allowances? What about an improvement in billeting allowances? What about an increase in the miserable 10s. paid to the old age pensioners? What about the iniquitous Purchase Tax, and the infernal Means Test? No, there are people in this House who, rather than make these concessions, rather than permit the people of this country to own its industries, would put the British Commonwealth in pawn.”

The question of coal has come up again and again in Parliament, since 1940. A dangerous and increasing shortage, threatening misery and ill-health and a fall in the production of war goods, has been met by incantations and very minor palliatives, because the pits, though “controlled,” are not taken over; because they are worked as competing concerns, not as parts of one unit; because the men in them—conscripted to them—are without hope.

The importance of two debates in 1943, on the Catering Bill and the Beveridge Report, is that in these debates the Tories were not only delaying or defeating measures of justice that could have given a hope to our people, and therefore improved our war effort; they were also “showing their teeth.” They were proving to Mr. Churchill and anyone else, that there was no way of carrying out Mr. Attlee’s promise. They were, by defending an unregulated industry with disgustingly low wages, or by delaying social security for all, not only achieving these immediate aims; they were also saying firmly, “Hands off our property and profits . . . no ‘controversial’ measures.”

In the Catering Bill debate, 9.2.43, 116 Tory M.Ps. voted against the Government—which was saved from defeat by Labour votes. One of the leaders of the opposition was L. H. Gluckstein (Nottingham), who quoted Sir Isadore Salmon, and asked whether any of the employees of catering firms wanted the Bill. Sir Isadore Salmon used to have close connections with the biggest catering firm in London; so did members of Mr. Gluckstein’s family.

Other Tories went to considerable lengths. Captain P. D. MacDonald (Isle of Wight) said:

“There is something very sinister about the way in which



this Bill has been introduced—something extremely dishonest.”

It is, of course, always considered “sinister” or “dishonest” to interfere with the property and profits of the people who matter. It is not considered “sinister” or “dishonest” to vote for your own private interests. (May I add that, as far as I know, Captain MacDonald has no interests in catering.)

Mr. Bracewell Smith (Dulwich) was another who voted against the Catering Bill. He had pledged himself, in his election literature, to give “unqualified support” to the National Government. He is a “self-made man” who started as a school-teacher with 35s. per week. He went into the hotel business, it is said, with a capital of only £200. He is now, or has recently been, owner or part-owner of the Café Royal and the Park Lane Hotel, a director of the Ritz and the Chairman of the Carlton.

A difficult choice was presented to one Tory M.P. in this debate. He had only a few months before been elected to the Commons, in a by-election, in which he was opposed by a young Independent with a “Left” programme. His name is Francis Beattie, and his constituency is Cathcart in Glasgow.

He had been elected on promises of the fullest support—unhesitating, complete, war-winning support—for Mr. Churchill and his Government. And his difficulty, early in 1943, was that his conscience bade him vote against the Government’s Catering Bill.

His conscience won; he voted against.

He is, or was recently, a director of six baking, catering and biscuit firms in the Glasgow area.

When the Beveridge Report was debated on February 18, 1943, one of the Government’s spokesmen for burying it deeply was Sir John Anderson, who holds, or held, the rank of Commander of the Crown of Italy, and has among his other honours that of helping to organise the “Black and Tans” in Ireland, and of having been Governor of Bengal.

He came into Parliament in 1938, and soon became the Government’s “expert” on A.R.P. “Anderson Shelters” are still to be seen about the country; I have even heard of two that are used. Their main value was to the shareholders in the steel trade. He spoke weightily against deep shelters, as Minister of Civil Defence, and told the House of Commons on 21.4.39 that “the attempt to produce bomb-proof shelters on any general scheme would appear impossible.”

For nearly a year of war Sir John and his colleagues kept a regulation in force that the London Tubes must not be used for shelter from air-raids. The official answer to questions was that



these Tube railways "might be needed for the rapid movement of troops and services"; the unofficial answer was that "mobs" could not be permitted. When the raids came the people of London, very sensibly, went into the Tubes. Sir John did not hear of this, he said, till several days later—although he was the Minister responsible. Anyhow, he had the wisdom not to attempt to alter the decision of the people.

He is as pessimistic about the possibility of sheltering people from want and hunger as he was about sheltering them from bombs. In the Beveridge Debate he said:

"We know neither what the national balance sheet will look like on the basis of existing commitments, nor what new claims we may have to meet, nor what orders of priority may have to be laid down, and it will certainly not be possible—it is my duty to say this—to meet in full all deserving claims."

No wonder the right-wing Tories continually press for Sir John—now in a strategic position, in charge of the nation's money—to be accepted as a successor to Mr. Winston Churchill.

"Can we afford it?" was the main note in the Tory evasion of Sir William Beveridge's conclusions, but a slightly different note was struck by Sir Herbert Williams (Croydon, S.). He said:

"The Beveridge Report as a whole is a very bad Report. It is very badly written. . . . The Right Hon. gentleman the Member for Platting (Mr. Clynes) . . . brought in *The Times* in support. What is the good of bringing *The Times* in? There is on *The Times* a gentleman called Mr. Carr, who is a great friend of Sir William Beveridge, and they have run the racket together. *The Times* is to-day the threepenny edition of the *Daily Worker*."

This is a point well worth noting. In every Continental development of Fascism, the Fascists have always—when it suited them—lumped together moderate Liberals, Radicals and Socialists of all sorts, and called them all "Communists." The Gestapo does the same thing to-day in the occupied countries; when another dozen "hostages" are murdered, whether they are Catholics or Liberals, or of no political party, the Nazis report that "Communists have been executed."

The *Daily Worker* is, of course, the organ of the Communist Party of Great Britain. Sir William Beveridge is a Liberal; Professor E. H. Carr's politics are defined on the leader page of *The Times*. It may seem, to some, an amusing "crack" to call *The Times* "the threepenny edition of the *Daily Worker*"; to others, with a deeper knowledge of the development of Fascism, it is a grim reminder of the shape of things that might come—if we permit.



It is often really difficult to distinguish, to-day, between Conservatism of the old-fashioned sort and the neo-Fascist infection that has been spreading for so many years. One point of distinction is the difference in attitude towards the Established Church and the Christian religion. Old-fashioned Conservatism would say—as Lord Hugh Cecil said in his book, *Conservatism*—that “Christian morals as revealed in the New Testament . . . are the standard by which right and wrong is judged by all the different elements of which the modern Conservative Party is made up”; to such Conservatives an Archbishop speaking on the political deductions from Christian morals is at least worth hearing and considering—though of course he is not infallible; his deductions can be answered and rejected. Quite a different attitude animates those who have moved beyond that old and out-of-date Toryism.

In 1934, when finance and industry were recovering from the depression of 1931, the question arose whether the “economy cuts” in benefits for the unemployed should be ended, and a million or more miserable homes made a little happier—or whether, on the other hand, the rich and the moderately comfortable should be given more to spend, by a reduction in the rate of Income Tax. The present Archbishop of Canterbury, then Archbishop of York, wrote to the Press urging the former course. According to the *Evening Standard*, 9.3.34, Sir Herbert Williams described this as a “gross impertinence,” and said he would not take his politics from any Archbishop:

“I think it a great mistake for any member of the clergy to interfere in political controversy.”

I am not stating that Sir Herbert Williams is, or is capable of being, a Fascist; I only point to a change away from old-fashioned Toryism.

In fairness, the strong points of such an M.P. as Sir Herbert Williams should be pointed out. He has on several occasions been reported in the Press as descending from the platform, at meetings he was addressing, and throwing out into the street any who interrupted. As he himself said (6.4.35):

“It is an accepted fact that when anyone misbehaves himself at any meeting I address in Croydon, I chuck him out.”

And Sir Herbert is also a literary critic. Of the Beveridge Report he complained, as already noted, that it is “badly written.” He went on: “the proposals and arguments are all mixed up.” In the same speech he made a crushing comment on another plan: “The Atlantic Charter is badly written and I never refer to it.” It is a pity that a man with so acute a sense of form should not set a better example to us all in this matter; in



the same speech he talked of "the cessation of hostilities" when he meant "the end of the war."

It is impossible to guess, at this moment, what will be the fate of Sir William Beveridge's proposals. By shelving them for a year, our Tories have shown their stubbornness and their strength to defend an outwork of the system by which they have lived in the past. By adopting a large part of the plan to-morrow, and pretending to make preparations for almost all of it, they may show their ability to gain votes by methods that frustrate democracy—methods that have worked in the past, as in 1924, when a forgery gave them a majority, or 1931, when the lie that savings banks deposits were being spent on the unemployed added to the National Government's supporters in Parliament, but not to its reputation for honesty.

But it is important to realise that what has been happening, since 1940, is a revival of the same old tendencies, in home affairs and also abroad, that brought us to Dunkirk. The pressure of the Tories is relentless, towards a world that is as like that of 1939 as possible, a world that will contain want and unemployment, a world where the great Trusts and the financiers have the last word. What the Tories will do about Beveridge cannot be guessed; but what they would like to do became clear when Mr. Osbert Peake (Leeds, N.), Under-Secretary at the Home Office, spoke at Oxford on 18.6.43.

This member of the Government, one of the "coming men" of Toryism, said that Sir William Beveridge had "raised hopes which could not be fulfilled. No system of weekly payments can abolish want in a free society; so long as men are free to spend their money as they please there will be homes in which want exists."

Poverty, a dear aunt of mine taught me long ago, is entirely due to the vices of the poor. It is not a matter of systems or of politics; it occurs because they spend their money on drink and keep coals in the bath-tub.

Mr. Peake continued: the Beveridge scheme was incompatible with freedom. Want, he said, could be abolished only by a system of regimentation such as that in the armed forces or in internment camps (*Daily Herald*, 22.6.43).

Sir William Beveridge replied that "such an argument is an insult to the intelligence of our people. . . . Is there any rational adult in Britain who thought that I meant to raise hopes that my plan would abolish all imperfections of human nature and make all men spend wisely every penny they receive; that by abolition of want I meant anything but that every citizen should at all



times have an income sufficient to meet his responsibilities? . . .

"The sinister point about this argument of Mr. Peake's is that the assertion that a few will spend money unwisely may be used as an excuse for depriving all of the minimum needed for subsistence, for making no attempt at all to abolish want."

It is hard to see how Mr. Peake represents the solid, hard-headed men and women of his Yorkshire constituency, men and women who know that freedom and hunger are not the same. Yet "freedom" in this sense—the freedom for rich and poor to dine at the Ritz or to sleep on the Embankment—is fast becoming the Tories' watchword. Those "controls" under which, in this war, capitalist industry has been forced to give a reluctant semblance of service to the community are to be abolished, in the interests of "freedom." And with them—few of us will much lament them, for they have usually been operated in the interests of the bigger businesses more than in the interests of the community—will be swept away the safeguards, necessary in war, that have meant for our people a more healthy diet, in spite of war shortages, in 1940-3 than in 1930-3. And the hopes will also be swept away; the hopes of a planned use of our resources, of a policy of plenty.

The planning and sharing that has made our allies the Russians so powerful is satirised as follows by another of the Tories' rising young men, Captain H. H. Balfour, who sits for the Isle of Thanet. (He is forty-six, at the end of 1943; but one remains "young" in the Tory Party up to the age of fifty-five or so.) His speech at Margate was reported by *Reynolds News*, 10.10.43, as follows:

The ideal of those who want a planned society is the "raising of utility families in accordance with State guidance; the children, as soon as possible, being enrolled into the ever-swelling ranks of a new race of little State stooges trained to serve and look only to the State for all sustenance, security and benefit right from the days of the State crèche to the evening of life, directed to be spent in some bare-walled but beautifully sanitary institution, run, of course, under a State medical service."

That is the "brave new world" that we must avoid, say these advocates of Tory freedom. But how often do they remind us of that cowardly old world they controlled, which slid so inevitably down into world war?

How do they answer the simple accusation that, with plenty for all well within our powers, they prefer and have preferred scarcity, because scarcity is or seems to be more immediately profitable to their class?



They have no answer. There are many among them who, in their own way, love their country. There are many who give a little of their surplus wealth or a little of their ease and leisure to the service of "good causes." But in general, by their deeds and words, they have in the past proved themselves to be property's patriots: their first loyalty was to their class and its interests, not to our people.

*His nightmare was that he was crouching, then crawling quickly, on his knees, and the rock was falling. He had been so willing to go where they went, to turn as they turned; and now they were jostling him on and down. They were going suddenly down a steep place into the sea.*

*He woke with a searing headache, and it was a relief to awake. He knew now who Arnold Wilson was.*

Quotations in the italicised passages in the foregoing chapters are from pp. 105, 189-200 and 363 of *Thoughts and Talks, 1935-7*, by Sir Arnold Wilson, M.P., K.C.I.E., C.S.I., C.M.G., D.S.O.—a book which was reprinted by the Right Book Club in 1938.

## CHAPTER IX

### THE SOUL OF A TORY M.P.

Their bodies were all our defence while we wrought our defences. . . .

They believed us and perished for it. Our statecraft, our learning  
Delivered them bound to the Pit and alive to the burning

Whither they mirthfully hastened as jostling for honour. . . .

*But who shall return us our children?*

RUDYARD KIPLING.

A HUNDRED YEARS FROM NOW, it will seem so simple. They will write, in the history text-books, of things that puzzle and torture us, as if these things were easy to understand, inevitable, could not have been otherwise.

They will write of how men made machines, and through the growing power of machines achieved so much of the conquest of Nature that every man and woman in the world could have ten or a dozen mechanical slaves, each as strong as a man but un-



wearying, to do for him the hard work of the world. And they will write that the new forces—of knowledge and technique, skill and science—embodied in suffering and blundering human beings, and in their machines and factories, were throttled and frustated for a time by those who wanted “to keep things as they are,” or even to turn the clock back—Conservatives, who wanted to conserve what had been, and Fascists who wanted to go back to the apparently secure limited world of tyranny.

And those great-grandchildren of children now living will learn, with placid and bored misunderstanding—and perhaps sometimes with a little envy—of wars and strikes, famines and pestilences, that arose because the old ways of living, the old laws, and the old class structure, made it impossible for millions of men to work, to produce, to live more abundantly.

They will see in Fascism the “death wish” of frustrated peoples: a “solution” for unemployment by preparing wars and fighting wars, and in those wars ridding the world not only of the accumulated goods that an out-of-date economic system could not digest, but also of the surplus of human beings made unnecessary, unwanted, under that system, by the growing powers and numbers of the slave machines.

Those who specialise in that period will see how inevitably Conservatism turned towards Fascism, based hopes on it, accepted it as an ally—until its madness broke into the world war. And even then the Tories could not see it for what it was.

They will read of the pathetic efforts of those who ruled the world to deal with the new powers of men and machines by a policy of restriction: burning wheat, throwing coffee into the sea, ordering farmers to grow less, restricting credit so that new stream-lined industries should not spring up and destroy the old-established wasteful ones.

They will even, if going far enough into the history of those days, come across the Right Honourable Oliver Stanley, in the Cabinet as usual, announcing how we could in the future “eliminate the waste of competition while retaining its incentive. Mr. Elliot’s agricultural marketing schemes provided an example of how it could be attempted. The essence of these schemes was the elimination of waste by relating the production of an article to the possibilities of selling it. Of course that meant restriction on the individual, on the price at which he was to sell, and the amount he was to produce” (*Times*, 7.11.33).

And the research worker will find in the same speech, put with



the family bluntness of the Stanleys, the close connection between Conservatism and Fascism I have been drawing:

"All around to-day they heard tell of dictatorships . . . with all their evils; dictatorships had at least one advantage; they did give continuity."

The same note again, from the same speaker:

"If democracies were slow and hesitant, while dictatorships could act with speed and with certainty, if dictatorships were united while democracies were divided, and if dictatorships could demand loyalty and self-sacrifice while democracies thought only of themselves, then democracy would fail here as elsewhere, because although democracy claimed to provide liberty, it would be unable to provide the other fundamental demand, and that was security."—*Times*, 17.12.36.

That from the right wing of the Tory young men; this from the left. It is from a review in *The Times* of the Rt. Hon. Harold MacMillan's book, *Reconstruction*:

"He assumes that the increase which has taken place in the rate of production in the world generally has outrun the powers of absorption of existing markets. . . . The ideal aimed at is a sort of 'guild capitalism' analagous in some respects to the 'Corporative State' which is being created in Italy" (1.12.33).

And from this "ideal" to the practical: Mr. Harold Macmillan, Tory M.P. for Stockton-on-Tees, becomes the Resident Minister of the British Cabinet at Allied H.Q. in North Africa, where he says that after talking the matter over "he felt that General Eisenhower was right in dealing with Darlan" (*Times*, 15.1.43).

Admiral Darlan, readers may remember, was the Fascist leader from old Petain's Government whom the Allies chose as their ally in Algiers.

But those who read of all this, a hundred years from now, will not know how real and close to the world was the danger that these Tories, seeking the alliance of militarists and monarchists throughout Europe, might have succeeded for years or generations in maintaining their power.

That is partly because, a hundred years from now, they will not see these men as human beings, with human feelings, as well as inhumane ones, with qualities that could in some circumstances be admired, as well as qualities that were almost fatal to our nation and our tradition.

They will not see—in the words used by Mr. Macmillan, when he was pleading that newspaper correspondents should not be harsh with men who had served the Vichy Government, and



thereby served the Germans, but now were given positions in authority in Algiers—that “there is a lot of difference between a traitor and one of the weaker brethren who chose the path of least resistance”—(*Evening Standard*, 8.2.43).

The Tories that I have tried to describe in this book were not deliberately traitors. They helped Hitler, by their votes and speeches, or advocated policies that ruined Europe and brought us to the Dunkirk water's-edge of disaster, because they believed what their teachers and leaders and colleagues told them, because they believed above all that they were the only people who could rule well, who had the right to control Britain and as much of the world as they could.

It was this real and very human belief in themselves as a ruling class that led them to accept and defend things that were clearly indefensible from the point of view of the nation. They alone knew how—and if they didn't know, no one else did. They were, more than any other political party, the landowners, the county people, those who were the natural friends and allies of the farmers, those who had been given the time to know and the chance to love this “green and pleasant land.” Yet because they alone could rule, because they had the divine right and no sufficient knowledge, they followed “Farmer Baldwin” and Mr. Chamberlain—who could not even pretend to be a farmer—while these gentlemen allowed our farming to slip down into decay, or propped it up only by measures of restriction.

And our rulers were also people who had had the chance to travel, to see far peoples and cities. Better than any of us, they should have realised what every previous ruling class of Britain had realised, since Queen Elizabeth's days: that Britain lives by its seamen and its ships.

Yet they allowed our seamen and shipbuilders to scatter, and our shipyards to be destroyed.

They were supposed to be, above all political parties, the men who looked to the safety and honour of Britain, our strength to help and guard those who relied on us, all across the world. I have described the years and the millions of money wasted, the failure to build arms. The scandal of the ships is just as important. Britain, in modern war, is in danger of starvation; 1917 proved that, and 1941 proved it again. Yet the Tories not merely permitted the destruction of our shipyards, between the two wars; they organised it.

Thirty-five shipbuilding yards were wrecked, after the last war—deliberately wrecked, so that the profit from other yards could



be greater. By August, 1942, not one of these yards had been reopened, in spite of our desperate need for ships.

These yards had been able to build one and a quarter million tons of shipping every year. We lack, to-day, the five million tons they could have built in the four years of this war.

Questioned about this, before the present war began, Sir Thomas Inskip—again!—doled out the soothing syrup. “I do not agree that there is any shortage of ships,” he said. Of course there was no shortage then. There was only a danger, as desperate and as needless as any this nation has ever faced.

In 1937–8 Britain had 2,000 fewer ships than in 1914. One hundred and fifty thousand skilled men—according to Lord Winster, who was for some time Parliamentary Private Secretary to the First Lord of the Admiralty—“drifted away from Newcastle, once the home of the world’s finest shipbuilders. Sixty thousand seamen came ashore. In 1938 one seaman in every four was out of work. . . . Between 1918 and 1939, 200,000 workers were lost to the [shipbuilding] industry.”

From the same pamphlet by Lord Winster (*The War on our Doorstep*, 1942) I quote Mr. Mark Hodgson, Chairman of the Boilermakers’ and Iron and Steel Shipbuilders’ trade union, speaking in 1941:

“National Shipbuilding Securities Ltd. smashed up the main industry of this maritime nation, closed yards and scattered to the winds those skilled tradesmen we now so much need. The Government of that time allowed that process to go on and we now need more ships than our remaining yards can produce.”

The same trade-union leader made it clear that during the period of “phoney war” no real reversal occurred in this policy of restriction; he reported 3,140 members unemployed at the beginning of 1940. This evidence is confirmed by a leading article in *Lloyd’s List*, 13.12.39, which deplored the agitation “that shipyards which were acquired by National Shipbuilding Securities Ltd. should again be made available for shipbuilding. . . . It is by no means certain that our existing shipbuilding capacity . . . is incapable of dealing with wartime demands.”

Thirty months later *The Times* reported (29.6.42):

“It is the state of shipping which now threatens danger to the whole war effort of the Allies.”

And the U.S. Secretary for the Navy, Colonel Knox, said on 1.7.41:

“Continuation of shipping losses at the present rate must bring victory and world domination to Hitler.”



The attack, in the end, failed. The courage and skill of seamen and airmen, the new weapons and inventions of the designers and scientists, won for us the Battle of the Atlantic. But the risk run was terrible—and avoidable. And the actual crippling effect on our war effort in 1941 and 1942 cannot be measured.

And all this was very specially and directly the responsibility of the Tory Party, because Sir James Lithgow, head of Shipbuilding Securities Ltd., is one of the real rulers of Scotland, at the centre of the group of industrialists, financiers and Members of Parliament who control with a tight fist the exploitation of that rich and poverty-stricken nation.

Sir James Lithgow, as the "expert," has remained as the head of Government shipbuilding during this war. Mr. H. N. Harrison, President of the Confederation of Shipbuilding and Engineering Unions, has stated, according to Lord Winster, that on account of his pre-war connection with the closing down of shipyards, Sir James Lithgow is "one of the greatest obstacles to bigger production." Clydeside members of the Commons have made the same point:

"In the minds of the men there existed grave suspicion of Sir James Lithgow."—Mr. McNeil (Greenock).

"For many years on Clydeside a ruthless system of closing yards. . . . The deep hatred which had been instilled into the minds of the men who had suffered bitterly."—Mr. Davidson (Maryhill).

But the Tory majority kept Sir James Lithgow in charge of our shipbuilding because the thing of first importance was not the desperate need for ships; the most important thing was that the ruling class should rule. And if it found most profitable a policy of restriction and wrecking, there was nothing wrong or blame-worthy about that policy. There couldn't be. To admit that it was an error would be "to lose face"; the king could not do wrong—and profit was king.

We live by the land of Britain, and by what can be brought to us in ships. The Tories have let both land and shipping slide in peace; during war they have seen to it that, whatever had to be altered, property rights remained. A bad farmer can be turned off his land; a bad landlord cannot. The ships we make to-day are not in general the most safe and suitable for war; they are those cheapest to run or most profitable for the after-war scramble for profit.

The soul of the Tory M.P. has not changed. He feels differently about Hitler than he did in 1938, but he does not feel differently about "the need for a strong hand." He has adopted and adapted



Mr. Churchill, but his outlook and fundamental policies remain as essentially restrictive as in the days of Mr. Chamberlain. He is, officially, at war for democracy; when you look abroad to the stories of Darlan and Peyrouton, of Amgot and Badoglio, the King of Greece and the Polish Government, you see that his version of "democracy" is a gentlemanly three-quarter Fascism, which he wants to establish in Europe instead of the ungentlemanly thoroughness of the Nazis.

At home he is preparing for us a world as like that of the nineteen-thirties as can be contrived. Abroad, it is not only monarchy and militarism that the Tories are trying to impose on Europe; some of them are also getting ready for the Third World War.

The Anglo-German Fellowship is dead—not, perhaps, past hope of revival, but not of use to-day. We have instead the Imperial Policy Group. A well-printed circular on good paper reached me through the post while I was writing this book, asking me to subscribe to the *Review of World Affairs*, which used to be published by the group and now bears the names of some of its leading members.

To be exact, it bears among other names those of three Tory M.P.s., who are members of the "Advisory Board" of the Group. They are A. R. Wise (Smethwick), Victor Raikes (Essex, S.E.) and W. Nunn (Newcastle-upon-Tyne, W.).

In June, 1942, the issue of the *Review of World Affairs* had as its main line of argument the simple proposition that the alliance between Russia and Britain could not usefully be relied upon, by the British people. One example may be quoted. Mr. Anthony Eden has said, in a B.B.C. broadcast:

"In all the territory that Hitler has overrun there is not one Russian Quisling."

The *Review of World Affairs* discovered 150,000 such people, fighting for Hitler. These people have not been mentioned by the German or the Russian communiqués; they have not been described by any reputable reporter or newspaper. They just exist in the pages of this *Review*.

Soon after this issue of the *Review* had been published, questions were asked in the Commons about it.

Sir Henry Morris-Jones, National Liberal M.P. for Denbigh, asked the Home Secretary if he intended "taking any action against those responsible for a publication called *Review of World Affairs*, which in its June 1 issue, has an article calculated to cast doubt upon the loyalty and effectiveness of Russia as an ally"?



Mr. Osbert Peake, Under-Secretary, answered for the Home Secretary:

"I share the view of my hon. Friend as to the objectionable nature of some of the references made in it to the significance of the Russian war effort in relation to the Allied cause and to internal conditions in Russia. On the other hand, it is the considered policy of His Majesty's Government—and I think of this House—that the special powers conferred on the Executive in wartime should not be used to interfere with expressions of opinion in insignificant publications of limited circulation, however objectionable and deplorable, provided they are not likely to have appreciable effect on the war effort."

*Sir H. Morris-Jones*: "Is not the whole of this article in its effect, if not in its purpose, calculated to endanger the Alliance in many directions and also jeopardise victory? May I further ask whether the Minister's attention has been drawn to another aspect of this publication, namely, that owing to the auspices under which it is published it is regarded by many as an official or semi-official publication? From that point of view will he not take some action?"

*Commander Locker-Lampson*: "Is this review subsidised by the enemy?"

*Mr. Neil MacLean*: "Is it not the case that a very large number of passages in this particular article were put forward not as expressions of opinion, but as statements of fact regarding incidents and conditions in Russia, and does he not think it fit either to warn or stop this publication in the same manner as he did in the case of the *Daily Worker* and the *Daily Mirror*?"

*Mr. Peake*: "I am sure the producers of this publication will take heed of the feelings of the House, and will have regard to the answer I have given on behalf of the Home Secretary."

The three Tory M.Ps. who still, after this, allow their names to be associated with the *Review* are made out of the same sort of material as those I have described, to the pitch of nausea, in this book.

Mr. Wise asked an audience in 1938 to "think where we should have been with the Socialist Party in office, or indeed with Mr. Winston Churchill and his supporters in authority at Westminster" (*Smethwick Telephone*, 14.5.38). He described the Soviets, if the same newspaper is accurate in its reporting, as "a pack of murderers, the enemies of God and man; their armed force is worthless as an ally" (24.2.40).

H. V. A. M. Raikes has called Soviet Russia "an Asiatic tyranny with a slight veneer of Western culture" and opposed



openly the negotiations with Russia that Mr. Chamberlain reluctantly, and with every possible delay, began in the spring of 1939.

Mr. Nunn is one of those M.Ps. nominated to sit in Parliament by the Tory Party under the electoral truce. He voted, of course, for the postponement of action on the Beveridge Plan; he voted, equally of course, against the Government on the Catering Bill. And I think he is fully representative of the "new Tories," new to the House of Commons, who have not had to meet the ordinary democratic opposition—and are quite up to or beyond the average of the "old Tories."

Apart from these three, the following M.Ps. have belonged to the Imperial Policy Group:

Sir Reginald Blaker (Spelthorne)

Lt. A. Lennox-Boyd (Bedford, Mid.)—recently appointed to a position in the Government.

Major L. Kimball (Loughborough).

Sir Herbert Williams (Croydon, S.).

All the above signed a letter to *The Times*, 31.10.33, stating the aims and objects of the Imperial Policy Group; the fact that their names have not appeared in recent issues of the *Review of World Affairs* is all I have been able to determine about their present membership.

Why do I bring in this "tail-piece" of outspoken opponents of our best ally, still carrying on their propaganda? Because the soul of the Tory Party has not changed. Because they are still essentially the same sort of people, with the same ideas and the same souls—if any—as they were when they wrecked the peace, brought us to war almost unarmed, jeered at Mr. Churchill as a warmonger, and voted for Mr. Chamberlain to stay in power during the month of Dunkirk.

And because the Tory Party is still putting into Parliament, unopposed under the electoral truce—nominating, not getting elected, such men as Sir Andrew Duncan, the Hon. Lionel Berry, and Captain Oliver Lyttelton. They have even selected and put into the House, in the middle of this war, an ex-member of the Anglo-German Fellowship, Sir Leonard Lyle (Bournemouth). Big business and the men who admired Nazi methods still dominate Toryism.

Here and there a few of the Tories have learned something. Major Patriot did so. But he was an exception—as a Tory M.P.—when he discovered that this Tory racket could not go on.



He was not an exception as an ordinary Briton—among whom I include millions who voted Tory in the past. They, and a good majority of ordinary people in this country, see that this despicable thing I have been describing cannot go on. At the next election, given a chance to do so, they will end it.







## THE END OF THE STORY

*It was such a queer strained group in the Smoke Room just about the time of Dunkirk—a week or two before Robert Patriot knew for certain that his son had not got back with the others. Men standing up, instead of sitting at ease. Men saying nothing, awkward, not knowing how to answer. And Sir Arnold Wilson—whom he knew scarcely at all, but admired as a soldier, as a straight man—standing there and talking of “atonement.”*

*It was a queer word. He kept using it. “I have got to atone.” Then he disappeared from Parliament. And they heard he had insisted on volunteering for the R.A.F., was flying as a tail-gunner in one of those old slow bombers we had to use until the new ones came in.*

*He atoned. The rear-gunner of those 1940 days, in those machines, was lucky, and a good shot, if he made a dozen sorties. Arnold Wilson died, as he had chosen.*

*There were others, Major Patriot thought, who had gone fighting, and had been killed. They had followed their tradition. But Arnold Wilson had been different. He had talked of atonement. And he had meant it.*

*I do not like Major Patriot. But I am glad, because he is of the same tongue as mine, that he never once thought—no part of his trapped and tortured mind thought—“I have atoned, by giving my son.”*

*Now he knew who Arnold Wilson was, he saw what the book he had been reading meant.*

*It meant, amongst other things, that Major Patriot would never face an election again. It meant perhaps more difficult things.*

*“If only . . .” he said to himself; he thought of 1935 and the Naval Treaty with Germany, he thought of the Rhineland, Spain, Austria, Munich, the vote he had given in May, 1940, to keep Chamberlain in power.*

*Was it right to give up politics? He was too broken to go on. “The country would do better without us; we were all wrong.”*

*His wife, when at last he reached her, knew what had happened as soon as she saw him. She had to nurse him. Perhaps that saved her from a similar breakdown. When he asked for the Chiltern Hundreds, leaving Parliament, on grounds of ill-health, she was strangely comforted. He needed her.*

*He could not go Arnold Wilson’s way. He was too old; the war had lightened up now, and things of that sort would not be allowed.*

*A man of over fifty as an air-gunner! His thoughts turned sometimes to*



the courage of that gesture, and its despair; he felt that if he could read its riddle, the grip within his mind would be lifted a little.

He began to work, when the doctors would let him. He even tried to work in a factory, making guns; but he was not fit enough. He found a job where he could work, talk, think, only in terms of metal, of things made, of cold fact and figures. He never spoke of politics. His politics had killed his son.



## INDEX OF M.Ps.

**T**HIS IS AN INDEX of the M.Ps. mentioned in this book, together with a voting record which shows the votes on eight important issues of these M.Ps., and of some who are not mentioned in the book.

In this voting record, on the issues mentioned below, a capital letter (A, B, C, etc.) means a bad vote, a small letter (a, b, c, etc.) means a good vote, and an italic letter (*a*, *b*, *c*, etc.) means that the M.P. was not then elected to Parliament or did not vote in that division.

Government positions and appointments are given in brackets with the names: P.S. means Parliamentary Secretary; *N.L.* means National Liberal; *N.La.* means National Labour; *L.* means Liberal; *La.* means Labour. All other M.Ps. listed are Tories.

The numbers following name and description are the pages on which mention of the M.P. will be found.

The divisions recorded are:

A. A motion by Mr. Attlee on Abyssinia, December 19, 1935, condemning the Hoare-Laval plan as calculated to "reward the declared aggressor at the expense of the victim, destroy collective security and conflict . . . with the Covenant of the League of Nations." It was defeated by 397 votes to 165.

A (capital) means a vote *against*.

a (small letter) means a vote *for*.

*a* (italic) means no vote; or that the M.P. was not yet elected to Parliament.

B. An amendment to the Address, November 12, 1936, moved by Mr. Kingsley Griffith for the Liberal Party, asking for a Ministry of Supply. It was defeated by 337 votes to 131.

B (capital) means a vote *against*.

b (small letter) means a vote *for*.

*b* (italic) means no vote; or the M.P. not yet elected.

C. A motion by Mr. Hugh Dalton for an independent and confidential inquiry into the state of our air defences, May 25, 1938. Mr. Dalton also pressed for a Ministry of Supply. The motion was defeated by 329 to 144.

C (capital) means a vote *against*.

c (small letter) means a vote *for*.

*c* (italic) means no vote; or the M.P. not yet elected.

D. Debate on Munich, October 6, 1938. Chamberlain's policy was supported by 366 votes to 144.

D (capital) means a vote *for* Mr. Chamberlain's policy.

d (small letter) *against*.

*d* (italic) no vote or not elected.



E. Proposal to increase Old Age Pensions, July 27, 1939. Defeated by 356 votes to 163.

E (capital) means a vote *against*.

e (small letter) a vote *for*.

e (italic) no vote or not elected.

F. Chamberlain or Churchill; the vote on May 8, 1940, that led to the fall of Chamberlain. Chamberlain was supported by 281 votes to 200.

F (capital) means a vote *for* Chamberlain.

f (small letter) a vote *against*.

f (italic) no vote, or not elected.

G. The Government's Catering Bill, February 8, 1943, carried by 283 votes to 116.

G (capital) means a vote *against* the Bill.

g (small letter) a vote *for*.

g (italic) no vote or not elected.

H. The Beveridge Report; debate on the Government's proposal that it should be shelved and watered down, February 18, 1943. The Government's proposal supported by 335 votes to 119.

H (capital) means a vote *against* Beveridge.

h (small letter) a vote *for*.

h (italic) no vote or not elected.



<i>M.P.</i>	<i>Constituency</i>	<i>Voting Record</i>
Acland-Troyte, Lt.-Col. G. J., C.M.G., D.S.O., 68	Tiverton	A B C D E F G H
Adams, Major S. V. T., 13, 31	Leeds, W.	a b c d E f g H
Agnew, Lt.-Com. P. G., 23	Camborne	A B C D E f g H
Albery, Sir Irving, M.C., 22	Gravesend	A B C D E F G H
Alexander, Brig.-Gen. Sir Wm., K.B.E., C.B., C.M.G., D.S.O., 22	Glasgow, C.	A b C D E F G H
Allen, Col. Sandeman, O.B.E., M.C., T.D., 23	Birkenhead, W.	A B C D E F g h
Allen, Lt.-Col. Sir Wm. James, K.B.E., D.S.O., 32	Armagh	A B c D e f g H
Amery, Rt. Hon. L. C. M. S. (Sec. of State for India and Burma), 12, 15, 19, 21, 38, 55	Sparkbrook	A B C d E f g H
Anderson, Rt. Hon. Sir John, G.C.B., G.C.S.I., G.C.I.E. (Chancellor of Exchequer), 23, 38, 75, 76	Scottish Universities	a b c D E F g H
Anstruther-Gray, W. J., 15	Lanark, N.	A B C D E f g h
Assheton, R. (Financial Sec., Treasury), 23	Rushcliffe	A B C D E F g H
Astor, Col. the Hon. J. J., 12, 21	Dover	A B C D E F g H
Astor, Viscountess, C. H., 15, 21	Sutton	A b C D E f g h
Astor, Hon. W. W., 23	Fulham, E.	A B C D e f g H
Attlee, Rt. Hon. C. R., <i>La</i> , (Deputy Prime Minister), 72, 74	Limehouse	a b c d e f g H
Baillie, Sir Adrian, Bt., 23	Tonbridge	a b C D E F G H
Balfour, Capt. Rt. Hon. H. H., M.C. (Under-Sec. of State for Air), 40, 79	Isle of Thanet	A b C D E F g H

*A, Abyssinia; B, Arms; C, Planes; D, Munich; E, Pensions; F, Chamberlain's fall; G, Catering; H, Beveridge.*



<i>M.P.</i>	<i>Constituency</i>	<i>Voting Record</i>
Baxter, A. Beverley, 12	Wood Green	A b C D E F G H
Beamish, Rear-Adm. T., C.B., R.N., 68	Lewes	a b C D E F g H
Beattie, F., 75	Cathcart	a b c d e f G H
Beauchamp, Sir Brograve, Bt., 24	Walthamstow, E.	A B C D E F g H
Beaumont, Major the Hon. R. E. B., 24	Portsmouth, C.	A B C D E F g H
Beit, Sir Alfred, Bt., 24	St. Pancras, S.E.	A B C D E f g H
Bennett, Capt. Sir Ernest, <i>N. La.</i> , 23, 49	Cardiff Central	A B C D E F g H
Bennett, Sir Peter, O.B.E., J.P.	Edgbaston	a b c d e f G H
Bere, R. De La	Worcester, Evesham	A B c D E f g H
Bird, Sir Robert, Bt., 23	Wolverhampton, W.	A b C D e f g H
Blair, Sir Reginald, 68	Hendon	A B C D E F G H
Blaker, Sir Reginald, 24, 88	Spelthorne	A B C D E F G h
Boles, Lt.-Col. D., 24	Wells	a b c d e F G H
Boothby, R. J. G., 31	Aberdeen, E.	A B C d e f g H
Bossom, A. C., 68	Maidstone	A B C D E F g H
Boulton, W. W. (Vice-Cham- berlain of the Household), 68	Sheffield, C.	A b C D E F g H
Bower, Com. R. T., 23, 48	Cleveland	A B C d E f G H
Boyce, H. Leslie, 24	Gloucester	A B C D E F g H
Brabner, R. H., Lt.-Com., D.S.O., 24, 28	Hythe	a b c d E F g h
Bracken, Rt. Hon. B. (Minister of Information), 13, 14, 31	Paddington, N.	a B c d E F g H
Braithwaite, Major A. N. D.S.O., M.C., 24	Buckrose	A B C D E f G H
Braithwaite, Lt.-Com. J. G.	Holderness	a b c d E F g h
Brass, Capt. Sir William, 24	Clitheroe	A b C D E F G H
Briscoe, Capt. R., M.C., 24-5	Cambridgeshire	A B C D e F g H
Broadbridge, Sir George Thomas, Bt., K.C.V.O., 25	City of London	a b C D E F g H

*A, Abyssinia; B, Arms; C, Planes; D, Munich; E, Pensions; F, Chamberlain's fall; G, Catering; H, Beveridge.*



<i>M.P.</i>	<i>Constituency</i>	<i>Voting Record</i>
Brocklebank, Sir Edmund, 68	Fairfield	A B c D E F g H
Brooke, H., 68	Lewisham, W.	a b c d E F g H
Brown, Col. the Rt. Hon. D. Clifton (Speaker)	Hexham	A B C D e f g h
Brown, Rt. Hon. A. E., M.C., N.L. (Chancellor of Duchy of Lancaster), 28, 68	Leith	A B C D E F g H
Brown, Brig.-Gen. H. Clifton	Newbury	A B C D E F G H
Buchan-Hepburn, P. G. T., 25	East Toxteth	A B C D E F g h
Bull, Bartle, Capt., 25	Enfield	A B C D E F G H
Bullock, Capt. M., M.B.E.	Waterloo	A B C D E f g H
Burgin, Rt. Hon. E. Leslie, LL.D., N.L., 52, 53	Luton	A B C D E F g H
Burton, Col. H. W., O.B.E., 32	Sudbury	A B C D E f g H
Butler, Rt. Hon. R. A. (Pres., Board of Education), 12, 22, 40	Saffron Walden	A B C D E F g H
Caine, G. R. Hall, 25	Dorset, E.	A b C D E F g H
Campbell, Sir Edward, Bt., J.P., 29	Bromley	A B C D E F g H
Carver, Col. W. H., 29	Howdenshire	A B C D E F G h
Cary, R. A., 29	Eccles	A B c D E F g H
Castlereagh, Viscount	Down	A B c D E f g H
Chair, S. S. de, 29	Norfolk, S.W.	A B C D E f g H
Challen, Flight Lt. C.	Hampstead	a b c d e f G H
Channon, H., 29	Southend	A B C D E F G H
Chapman, A. (Parliamentary Under-Sec. for Scotland), 15	Rutherglen	A B C D E F g H
Chapman, Sir Samuel, 32, 68	Edinburgh, S.	A B c D E F g H
Christie, J. A.	Norfolk, S.	A B C D E f G H
Churchill, R., 13, 26, 29, 30	Preston	a b c d e f g h
Churchill, Rt. Hon. Winston S., C.H. (Prime Minister), 11, 13, 14, 16, 26, 37, 49, 52, 71, 74, 86, 87, 88	Epping	a B c d E F g h

*A, Abyssinia; B, Arms; C, Planes; D, Munich; E, Pensions; F, Chamberlain's fall; G, Catering; H, Beveridge.*



<i>M.P.</i>	<i>Constituency</i>	<i>Voting Record</i>
Clarke, Col. Ralph S., T.D., D.L., 29, 68	East Grinstead	<i>a B C D E F g h</i>
Clarry, Sir Reginald, 29	Newport	<i>A B C D E F g H</i>
Cobb, Capt. E. C., D.S.O. 29, 30	Preston	<i>a b C D E F g H</i>
Colegate, Arthur	The Wrekin	<i>a b c d e f G H</i>
Colman, N. C. D., 32, 68	Brixton	<i>A B C D E F g H</i>
Conant, Capt. R. J. E., 13	Bewdley	<i>a b C D E F g H</i>
Cook, Sir Thomas, 30	Norfolk, N.	<i>A B c D e f g h</i>
Cooke, J. Douglas, 68	Hammersmith, S.	<i>A B C D E F g H</i>
Cooper, Rt. Hon. A. Duff, D.S.O., 30, 31, 51	St. George's	<i>A B C d e f g H</i>
Courthope, Col. Rt. Hon. Sir George, Bt., M.C., 30, 73	Rye	<i>A b C D E F G H</i>
Cox, Capt H. B. Trevor, 30	Chester, Staly- bridge and Hyde	<i>a b C D E f g h</i>
Craven-Ellis, W., 15	Southampton	<i>a b C D e F g H</i>
Crichton-Stuart, Lord C., 30	Northwich	<i>A B C D E f g H</i>
Critchley, A.	Liverpool, Edge Hill	<i>A B C D E f g h</i>
Crooke, Sir Smedley, J.P., 49	Deritend	<i>A B c D E F g H</i>
Crookshank, Capt. Rt. Hon. Harry (Postmaster-General), 30	Gainsborough	<i>A B C D E F g H</i>
Cross, Rt. Hon. Sir Ronald, Bt., 16, 22	Rossendale	<i>A B c D E F g h</i>
Crowder, J. F. E., 31	Finchley	<i>A B C D E F G H</i>
Culverwell, C. T., 13	Bristol, W.	<i>A B C D E F g H</i>
Daggar, G., <i>La</i> , 73	Abertillery	<i>a b c d e f g h</i>
Davidson, J. J., <i>La</i> , 85	Glasgow, Maryhill	<i>a b c d e f g h</i>
Davidson, Viscountess, 68	Hemel Hempstead	<i>a b C D E F g H</i>
Davies, C., K.C., <i>L</i> , 43	Montgomery	<i>A B c D E f g h</i>

*A, Abyssinia; B, Arms; C, Planes; D, Munich; E, Pensions; F, Chamberlain's fall; G, Catering; H, Beveridge.*



<i>M.P.</i>	<i>Constituency</i>	<i>Voting Record</i>
Davies, Major Sir George, C.V.O., 68	Yeovil	A B c D e F g h
Davison, Sir William, K.B.E.	Kensington, S.	A B C d E f G H
Denville, A., 28	Newcastle-upon- Tyne, C.	A b C D E f g H
Doland, Lt.-Col. G. F., O.B.E., J.P., 28	Balham and Tooting	a B C D E F G H
Donner, P. W., 27	Basingstoke	A B c D E F G H
Dower, Lt.-Col. Alan V. G., 32	Penrith and Cockermouth	a B C D e f G H
Drewe, C. (Assistant Whip), 59	Honiton	A B c D E F G H
Duckworth, G. A. V.	Shrewsbury	A B c d E f g H
Duckworth, W. R.	Manchester, Moss Side	A B c D E f g H
Dugdale, Major T. L.	Richmond, York	A B c D E f g H
Duncan, Rt. Hon. Sir Andrew, G.B.E., LL.D. (Minister of Supply), 59, 88	City of London	a b c d e F g h
Duncan, Capt. J. A., 68	Kensington, N.	A B C D E F G H
Dunglass, Lord, 32	Lanark	A B C D E F g h
Eden, Rt. Hon. Anthony, M.C. (Sec. of State for Foreign Affairs), 49, 86	Warwick and Leamington	a B c d E F g H
Edmondson, Major Sir James, D.L. (Treas. of the House- hold), 69	Banbury	A b C D E F g H
Elliot, Rt. Hon. W. E., M.C., 59-60	Kelvingrove	A B C D E F g h
Ellis, Sir Geoffrey, Bt., 69	Ecclesall	A B C D e F G H
Elliston, Capt. G. S., M.C., J.P., 69	Blackburn	A B c D E F G H
Emery, J. F.	Salford, W.	A B C D E F g H
Emmott, C. E. G. C.	Surrey, E.	A B C D E f g H
Emrys-Evans, P. V. (Under- Sec., Dominions)	Derby, S.	A B C d E f g H

*A, Abyssinia; B, Arms; C, Planes; D, Munich; E, Pensions; F, Chamberlain's fall; G, Catering; H, Beveridge.*



<i>M.P.</i>	<i>Constituency</i>	<i>Voting Record</i>
Entwistle, Major Sir Cyril, 60	Bolton	A B C D E F g H
Errington, Eric, 60	Bootle	A b C D E F g H
Erskine-Hill, A. G., K.C., 61	Edinburgh, N.	A B C D E F g H
Etherton, Ralph, 69	Stretford	a b c d e F g H
Evans, Col. Arthur	Cardiff, S.	A B C D E f g H
Everard, Sir W. Lindsay, J.P.	Melton	A B C D E f G H
Findlay, Sir Edmund, Bt.	Banff	A B C D E f g H
Fleming, Squad.-Ldr. E. L., K.V., 48	Withington	A B C D E F g h
Fox, Flt.-Lt. Sir Gifford, Bt., 61	Henley	A B C D E F G H
Fyfe, Sir David, K.C. (Solicitor- General)	West Derby	A b c D E f g H
Galbraith, Com. T. D.	Pollok	a b c d e f G H
Gibson, Sir Granville, 69	Pudsey and Otley	A b C d E F G H
Gledhill, G., 32	Halifax	A b c D E F G H
Gluckstein, L. H., 74	Nottingham, E.	A B C D E f G H
Glyn, Major Sir Ralph, Bt., M.C.	Abingdon	A B C D E f g H
Goldie, N. B., K.C., 32	Warrington	A b C D E F g H
Gower, Sir Robert, K.C.V.O., O.B.E., 43, 44	Gillingham	A b C D E F G H
Graham, Capt. A. C., 69	Chester, Wirral	A b C D E F G H
Grant-Ferris, R.	St. Pancras, N.	a b c D E f g h
Greene, W. P. C., 69	Worcester	A B C D E F G H
Grenfell, D. R., C.B.E., <i>La.</i> , 48	Gower	a b c d e f g h
Gridley, Sir Arnold, K.B.E., 61	Stockport	A B C D E F G H
Grigg, Sir Edward, K.C.M.G., D.S.O., M.C., 38	Altrincham	A b c D E F g H
Grimston, R. V. (Assistant Postmaster-General), 69	Westbury	A B C D E F g H
Guest, Col. Hon. Henry, 61	Drake	a B C D E F g H

*A, Abyssinia; B, Arms; C, Planes; D, Munich; E, Pensions; F, Chamberlain's fall; G, Catering; H, Beveridge.*



<i>M.P.</i>	<i>Constituency</i>	<i>Voting Record</i>
Guest, Major Hon. Oscar, 61	Camberwell, N.W.	A B C D E F g h
Guinness, T. L. E. B., 43	Bath	A B C D E F g h
Gunston, Major Sir Derrick, Bt., M.C., 28	Thornbury	A B c d E f g H
Hacking, Rt. Hon. Sir Douglas H., Bt., O.B.E., 61	Chorley	A B C D E F g H
Hambro, Capt. Angus, 32	Dorset, N.	a b C D E F g h
Hannah, I. C.	Wolverhampton, Bilston	A b C D E F g h
Hannon, Sir Patrick, 38, 39	Moseley	A B C D E F G H
Harland, H. P., 69	Belfast, E.	a b c d e F g h
Haslam, H. C., 43	Horncastle	a B C D E F G h
Heilgers, Capt. F. F. A.	Bury St. Edmunds	A B C D E f g H
Hely-Hutchinson, M. R., 62	Hastings	a b C D E F G H
Henderson, J. J. C.	Leeds, N.E.	a b c d e f G H
Heneage, Lt.-Col. A. P., D.S.O., 69	Louth	A B C D E F g h
Hepworth, J., 69	Bradford, E.	A B C D E F g h
Hewlett, T. H.	Manchester, Exchange	a b c d e f G H
Higgs, W. F., 69	Birmingham, W.	a b c d E F g H
Hoare, Lt.-Col. Rt. Hon. Sir Samuel, Bt., G.C.S.I., G.B.E., C.M.G., 18, 44, 57	Chelsea	a b C D E F g h
Hogg, Hon. Quintin, 27	Oxford	a b c d E f g H
Horsbrugh, Miss F., C.B.E. (P.S., Ministry of Health), 69	Dundee	A b C D E F g H
Howitt, Dr. A. B., C.V.O., 32	Reading	A B C D E F G H
Hudson, Sir Austen, Bt., 69	Hackney, N.	A B C D E F g H
Hudson, Rt. Hon. R. S., C.H. (Minister of Agriculture), 41	Southport	a b C D E F g H
Hulbert, Sqd.-Ldr. N. J., 43, 47	Stockport	a B C D E F g H

*A, Abyssinia; B, Arms; C, Planes; D, Munich; E, Pensions; F, Chamberlain's fall; G, Catering; H, Beveridge.*



<i>M.P.</i>	<i>Constituency</i>	<i>Voting Record</i>
Hume, Sir George, 69	Greenwich	A B C D E F g H
Hunloke, Capt. H., 34	Derbyshire, W.	a b c D E f g h
Hunter, T., 69	Perth and Kinross, Perth	A B C D E F G h
Hurd, Sir Percy, 69	Devizes	A B C D E F G H
Hutchinson, Major Geoffrey, M.C., T.D., K.C., 49	Ilford	a b C D E f g H
James, Wing-Com. A. W. H., M.C., 43, 44	Wellingborough	A B C D E f g H
Jarvis, Sir John, Bt.	Surrey, Guildford	A B c D E f G H
Jennings, R., 63	Hallam	a b c d E F g H
Jones, Sir George, K.C., 32	Stoke Newington	A B C D E F G H
Jones, Lewis, <i>N.L.</i> (Charity Commissioner), 67	Swansea, W.	a b C D E F g h
Joynson-Hicks, Lt.-Com. L. W.	Chichester	a b c d e f G H
Keir, Mrs. Cazalet, 49	Islington, E.	A B C D E F g H
Kerr, H. W.	Oldham	A B C d E f g H
Kerr, Sir John Graham, F.R.S., J.P., 63	Scottish Universities	A B c D E F g H
Kimball, Major L., 69, 88	Leicester, Loughborough	A B C D E F G H
Knox, Maj.-Gen. Sir Alfred, K.C.B., C.M.G., 43, 44	Wycombe	a B c D E F G H
Lamb, Sir Joseph, 69	Stone	A B C D E F g H
Lambert, Rt. Hon. George, <i>N.L.</i> , 68	South Molton	A b C D E F g h
Lees-Jones, J., 69	Blackley	A B C d E F G H
Leigh, Sir John, Bt., 33-4	Clapham	A B C D e F g H
Leighton, Major B. E. P., 69	Oswestry	a B C D E F G H

*A, Abyssinia; B, Arms; C, Planes; D, Munich; E, Pensions; F, Chamberlain's fall; G, Catering; H, Beveridge.*



<i>M.P.</i>	<i>Constituency</i>	<i>Voting Record</i>
Lennox-Boyd, Lt. A. T., R.N.V.R. (Parliamentary Sec., Ministry Aircraft Pro- duction), 31, 88	Bedford, Mid.	A B C D E F g h
Levy, T., 69	Elland	A B C D E F G H
Lewis, O., 69	Colchester	A B C D E F g H
Liddall, W. S., C.B.E., J.P., 63	Lincoln	A B C D E F G H
Little, Rev. James, 69	Down	a b c d E F g h
Llewellyn, Col. Rt. Hon. J. J., C.B.E., M.C., T.D. (Minister of Food), 69	Uxbridge	A B c D E F g h
Lloyd, Major E. G. R., D.S.O.	Renfrew, E.	a b c d e f g H
Lloyd, Rt. Hon. G. W. (Joint P.S., Fuel and Power), 69	Ladywood	A B C D E F g h
Locker-Lampson, Com. O., C.M.G., D.S.O., 39, 87	Handsworth	A B C D E f g h
Loftus, P. C.	Lowestoft	A B C D E f G H
Lucas, Major Sir Jocelyn, Bt., M.C., 69	Portsmouth, S.	a b c d E F g H
Lyle, Sir Leonard, Bt., 88	Bournemouth	a b c d e f G H
Lyons, Major A. M., K.C.	Leicester, E.	A B C D E f g H
Lyttelton, Capt. Rt. Hon. O., D.S.O., M.C. (Minister of Production), 31, 61, 88	Aldershot	a b c d e f g H
MacAndrew, Col. Sir Charles, T.D., 69	Buteshire and Ayrshire	A B c D E F G H
McCallum, Maj. Duncan, M.C., 39	Argyll	a b c d e F G H
McCorquodale, M. S. (P.S., Ministry of Labour), 69	Sowerby	A B C D E F g H
Macdonald, Capt. P. D., 74, 75	Isle of Wight	A B C D E f g H
McEwen, Capt. J. H. F. (Lord of the Treasury), 31, 50	Berwick and Haddington	A B C D E F g H
McKie, J. H., 69	Galloway	A B C D E F g h
Maclean, N., <i>La.</i> , 87	Govan	a b c d e f g h

*A, Abyssinia; B, Arms; C, Planes; D, Munich; E, Pensions; F, Chamberlain's fall; G, Catering; H, Beveridge.*



<i>M.P.</i>	<i>Constituency</i>	<i>Voting Record</i>
Macmillan, Rt. Hon. H. (Min- ister Resident in N.-W. Africa), 82	Stockton-on- Tees	A b C d E f g h
Macnamara, Lt.-Col. J. R. J.	Essex, Chelmsford	A B C D E f g H
McNeil, H., <i>La.</i> , 85	Greenock	a b c d e f g h
Magnay, T., <i>N.L.</i> , 31, 49	Gateshead	A b c D E F g H
Maitland, Sir Adam, 69	Faversham	A B C D E F g H
Makins, Brig.-Gen. Sir Ernest, K.B.E., C.B., D.S.O., 69	Knutsford	A B C D E F g H
Marsden, Com. A.	Chertsey	a b c D E f g h
Mayhew, Lt.-Col. John, 69	East Ham, N.	A B C D e F g H
Mellor, Sir John, Bt., 69	Tamworth	A B C D E F G H
Mills, Sir Frederick, Bt., 32	Leyton, E.	A B c D E f g h
Mills, Major J. D., T.D. (Eccle- siastical Commissioner)	New Forest and Christchurch	A B C D E F G H
Mitchell, Col. H. P., 38	Brentford and Chiswick	A B C D E F g H
Mitcheson, Sir George, J.P., 63	St. Pancras, S.W.	A B C D E F g H
Moore, Lt.-Col. Sir Thomas, C.B.E., 31, 42, 47-8, 49	Ayr Burghs	A B C D E F g H
Morgan, R. H., 32	Stourbridge	A B C D E F g H
Morris, J. P., 63, 64	Salford, N.	A B C D E F g h
Morris-Jones, Sir Henry, M.C., <i>N.L.</i> , 86, 87	Denbigh	A B C D E f G H
Morrison, Major J. G.	Salisbury	a b c d e f G H
Morrison, Rt. Hon. H. S., <i>La.</i> (Minister for Home Security), 55, 56	Hackney, S.	a b c d e f g H
Morrison, Rt. Hon. W. S., K.C., M.C. (Minister for Town and Country Planning), 39	Cirencester and Tewkesbury	A B C D E F g H

Nall, Col. Sir Joseph, D.S.O., 69    Hulme    A B C D E F G h

*A, Abyssinia; B, Arms; C, Planes; D, Munich; E, Pensions; F, Chamberlain's  
fall; G, Catering; H, Beveridge.*



<i>M.P.</i>	<i>Constituency</i>	<i>Voting Record</i>
Neven-Spence, Major B. H. H., D.L.	Orkney and Shetland	A B c d E f g H
Nield, Lt.-Col. Basil, 69	City of Chester	a b c d e F g h
Nunn, W., 86, 88	Newcastle-upon- Tyne, W.	a b c d e f G H
O'Neill, Rt. Hon. Sir Hugh, Bt., 64	Antrim	A B C D E F g H
Orr-Ewing, I. L., 69	Weston-super- Mare	A b c D E F g H
Palmer, G. E. H., 69	Hampshire, Winchester	A B C D e F g H
Peake, Rt. Hon. Osbert (Parl. Under-Sec., Home Office), 39, 78, 79, 87	Leeds, N.	A B C D E F g H
Peat, C. U., M.C. (P.S., Ministry of Supply), 69	Darlington	A B C D e F g H
Petherick, Major M.	Penryn and Falmouth	A B c D E f G H
Pickthorn, K. W. M., 69	Cambridge University	A b C D E F g H
Pilkington, Capt. R. A., M.C. (Civil Lord of the Admiralty)	Lancaster, Widnes	A B C D E f g H
Plugge, Capt. L. F., 69	Rochester, Chatham	A B C D E F g h
Ponsonby, Col. C. E., 69	Sevenoaks	A B C d E F g H
Pownall, Lt.-Col. Sir Assheton, O.B.E., T.D., 42	Lewisham, E.	A B C D E F g H
Procter, Major H. A., 69	Accrington	A B C D E F G H
Purbrick, R., 32	Walton	a B c D e f G H
Pym, L. R. (Lord of the Treas.), 69	Monmouth	a b c d e F g H
Radford, E. A., 64	Rusholme	A B C D E F G H

*A, Abyssinia; B, Arms; C, Planes; E, Munich; E, Pensions; F, Chamberlain's fall; G, Catering; H, Beveridge.*



<i>M.P.</i>	<i>Constituency</i>	<i>Voting Record</i>
Raikes, Flt.-Lt. H. V. A. M., 64, 65, 86, 87	Essex, S.E.	A B C <i>d</i> E F g H
Ramsay, Capt. A. H. M., 49, 50	Peebles and Southern	A <i>b</i> C D E <i>f</i> g h
Ramsden, Sir Eugene, Bt., O.B.E., J.P., 38	Bradford, N.	A <i>b</i> C D <i>e</i> F g H
Rankin, Sir Robert, Bt., 70	Kirkdale	A B <i>c</i> D E F G H
Rawson, Sir Cooper	Brighton	A B C D E F g h
Rayner, Major R., 43, 44	Devon, Totnes	A B <i>c</i> D E F g h
Reed, A. C., 70	Exeter	A <i>b</i> C D E F g h
Reed, Sir Stanley, K.B.E., LL.D., 70	Aylesbury	<i>a</i> b C D E F G H
Reid, Rt. Hon. J. S. C., K.C. (Lord Advocate), 70	Hillhead	<i>a</i> b <i>c</i> D E F g h
Reid, W. A.	Derby	A <i>b</i> C D <i>e</i> F g H
Rickards, G. W.	Skipton	A B C D E F g H
Robertson, D.	Streatham	<i>a</i> b <i>c</i> <i>d</i> <i>e</i> F g H
Robinson, J. R., 65	Blackpool	A B C D <i>e</i> F g H
Ropner, Col. L., M.C., T.D.	Barkston Ash	A B C <i>d</i> E <i>f</i> g h
Ross, Major Sir Ronald, Bt., 70	Londonderry	<i>a</i> B C D E F g h
Rowlands, G., C.B.E., 28	Flint	A B <i>c</i> D E F G H
Royds, Adm. Sir Percy, C.B., C.M.G., 70	Kingston-upon-Thames	<i>a</i> b C D E F G H
Russell, Sir Alexander 43	Tynemouth	A B C D E F g H
Salt, E. W., 70	Yardley	A B C D E F G H
Sanderson, Sir Frank, Bt., 43, 44, 49	Ealing	A B <i>c</i> D E F g H
Sandys, E. D. (P.S., Ministry of Supply)	Norwood	A B <i>c</i> <i>d</i> <i>e</i> <i>f</i> g H
Scott, Lord William	Roxburgh and Selkirk	A B C D E <i>f</i> G H

*A, Abyssinia; B, Arms; C, Planes; D, Munich; E, Pensions; F, Chamberlain's fall; G, Catering; H, Beveridge.*



<i>M.P.</i>	<i>Constituency</i>	<i>Voting Record</i>
Selley, H. R., 70	Battersea, S.	A B C D E F G H
Shaw, Major P. S.	Liverpool, Wavertree	A B C D <i>e</i> F G H
Shaw, Capt. W. T., 70	Forfar	A B C D E F G H
Shepperson, Sir Ernest, 70	Leominster	A B C D E F <i>g h</i>
Shute, Col. Sir John, C.M.G., D.S.O., D.L., 32	Liverpool, Exchange	A <i>b</i> C D E F G <i>h</i>
Simmons, O. E.	Duddeston	A B <i>c</i> D E <i>f</i> G H
Sinclair, Major Rt. Hon. Sir Archibald, Bt., K.T., C.M.G., (Sec. of State for Air), 54, 55	Caithness and Sutherland	<i>a b c d e f g</i> H
Smiles, Lt.-Col. Sir Walter, C.I.E., D.S.O.	Blackburn	A B C D E <i>f g h</i>
Smith, Bracewell, 70, 75	Dulwich	A B C D E F G H
Smith, Sir Robert, J.P., 70	Aberdeen, Central	A B C D <i>e</i> F G <i>h</i>
Smithers, Sir Waldron, J.P., 65, 70	Chislehurst	A <i>b</i> C D E F G H
Snadden, W. M., 70	Kinross and W. Perth	<i>a b c d</i> E F G H
Somerset, T., 32	Belfast, N.	A <i>b</i> C <i>d</i> E F G <i>h</i>
Somervell, Rt. Hon. Sir Donald, O.B.E., K.C. (Attorney- General), 65	Crewe	A B C D E F <i>g</i> H
Southby, Comdr. Sir Archibald, Bt., 65, 66	Epsom	A B <i>c</i> D E F G <i>h</i>
Stanley, Rt. Hon. Oliver, M.C. (Sec. of State for the Colonies), 66, 67, 81, 82	Westmorland	A B C D E F <i>g</i> H
Stewart, W. John, 32	Belfast, S.	<i>a</i> B <i>c</i> D E <i>f g h</i>
Storey, S., 70	Sunderland	A <i>b</i> C D E F <i>g</i> H
Stourton, Major the Hon. J. J., 43, 44-5	Salford, S.	A B C D <i>e</i> F <i>g h</i>

*A, Abyssinia; B, Arms; C, Planes; D, Munich; E, Pensions; F, Chamberlain's fall; G, Catering; H, Beveridge.*



<i>M.P.</i>	<i>Constituency</i>	<i>Voting Record</i>
Strauss, H. G. (P.S., Ministry of Town and Country Planning), 70	Norwich	A B C D E F g H
Strickland, Capt. W. F., 70	Coventry	A b c D E F G H
Stuart, Rt. Hon. James, M.V.O., M.C. (Chief Whip), 70	Moray and Nairn	A B c D E F g h
Studholme, Capt. H. G.	Tavistock	a b c d e f G H
Sueter, Rear-Adm. Sir Murray, C.B., 43	Hertford	A B C D E F G H
Sutcliffe, Harold, 70	Royton	A B c D E F g H
Sykes, Maj.-Gen. Rt. Hon. Sir Frederick, G.C.S.I., G.C.I.E., G.B.E., K.C.B.	Nottingham, Central	a b c d e f G H
Tasker, Sir Robert, 70	Holborn	A B C D e F g H
Tate, Mrs. M. C.	Frome	A B C D E f g h
Taylor, Capt. C. S.	Eastbourne	A B C D E f G H
Taylor, Vice-Admiral E. A., C.M.G., C.V.O., 42, 70	Paddington, S.	A B C D E F G H
Thomas, J. P. L. (Financial Sec., Admiralty), 70	Hereford	A B c d E F g H
Thomson, Sir Douglas, Bt., 70	Aberdeen, S.	A B C D E F g H
Thorneycroft, Major G. E. P., 70	Stafford	a b c D E F g h
Thornton-Kemsley, C. N.	Kincardine and Western	a b c d E f g H
Touche, G. C., 70	Reigate	A B C D E F g H
Tree, A. R. L. F.	Harborough	A B C D E f g H
Tufnell, Lt.-Com. R. L., 70	Cambridge	A B C D E F g H
Wakefield, W. W., 70	Wiltshire, Swindon	A B C D E F g H

*A, Abyssinia; B, Arms; C, Planes; D, Munich; E, Pensions; F, Chamberlain's fall; G, Catering; H, Beveridge.*



<i>M.P.</i>	<i>Constituency</i>	<i>Voting Record</i>
Walker-Smith, Sir Jonah	Barrow-in-Furness	A B C D E F g H
Ward, Col. Sir Lambert, Bt., C.V.O., D.S.O., T.D., 67	Kingston-upon-Hull	A B C D E F G H
Ward, Miss Irene, M.B., C.B.E., 70	Walsend	A b C D e F g H
Wardlaw-Milne, Sir John, K.B.E., 49	Worcester, Kidderminster	A b C D E f G H
Waterhouse, Capt. C., M.C. (P.S., Board of Trade), 70	Leicester, S.	A B c D E F g H
Watt, F. C.	Edinburgh, Central	a b c d e f G H
Watt, Brig. G. S. Harvie, T.D., 70	Richmond	a b C D E F g H
Wayland, Sir William, 70	Canterbury	A B C D E F G h
Webbe, Sir Harold, C.B.E., 70	Abbey	a b c d E F G H
Wedderburn, H. J. S.	Renfrew, W.	A b C D E f g H
Wells, Sir Richard, 70	Bedford	A B C D E F G H
Weston, W. Garfield, 70	Macclesfield	a b c d e F G H
White, Sir Dymoke, Bt., 70	Fareham	a b c d e F G H
Wickham, Lt.-Col. E. T. R., M.V.O., 43, 45	Somerset, Taunton	A B C D E F G H
Williams, Com. C. (Deputy Chairman of Committees), 70	Torquay	a b c D E F G H
Williams, Sir Herbert, 38, 76, 77, 88	Croydon, S.	A b c D E F G H
Windsor-Clive, Lt.-Col. G., C.M.G., 70	Ludlow	A B C D E F g H
Winterton, Rt. Hon. Earl, 40	Horsham and Worthing	A B C D E f g H
Wise, Major A. R., 86, 87	Smethwick	a b C D E f g H
Womersley, Rt. Hon. Sir Walter J.P. (Minister of Pensions), 28	Grimsby	A b C D E F g H
Wood, Capt. the Hon. C.	York	a b c D E f g h

*A, Abyssinia; B, Arms; C, Planes; D, Munich; E, Pensions; F, Chamberlain's fall; G, Catering; H, Beveridge.*



<i>M.P.</i>	<i>Constituency</i>	<i>Voting Record</i>
Wragg, H., 70	Belper	A B C D E F g H
Wright, Group Capt. J. A. C.	Erdington	a B C D E f g H
York, Major Christopher	Ripon	a b c d E f g H
Young, A. S. L. (Lord of the Treasury), 70	Glasgow, Partick	A B C D E F g H

*A, Abyssinia; B, Arms; C, Planes; D, Munich; E, Pensions; F, Chamberlain's fall; G, Catering; H, Beveridge.*



